Class 270.1 Q Book H229E
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK V.2
C.1

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

ɔOLOGICAL TRANSLATION LIBRARY

VOL. XX.

ɴACK'S THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY
IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES
VOL. II.

THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

BY

ADOLF HARNACK

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN, AND MEMBER OF THE ROYAL PRUSSIAN ACADEMY

Translated and edited by

JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., D.D. (ST ANDREWS)

VOL. II.

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
LONDON: WILLIAMS AND NORGATE
1905

270.1Q
H229 E
v. 2
c.1

38731

PREFATORY NOTE TO VOL. II.

Several additions and corrections, chiefly relating to the geographical data, which have been forwarded by the author, are incorporated in this volume. In the first volume the reader is requested to substitute, on page 173 (line 13 from top), "that those" for "those that"; on page 203 (line 7 from foot), "Cilicia" for "Cicilia"; on page 218 (line 7 from top), "*ep.*" for "ch."; on page 338 (line 13 from top), "Plin." for "Phin."; also on page 453 (line 3 from foot), "Synnada" for "Synada."

To the list of serious reviews, one has now to add those by J. Réville (*Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, March–April 1904) and G. M. (*Revue int. de Théologie*, April–June 1904).

JAMES MOFFATT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOOK III.

PAGES

Chapter III. The Names of Christian Believers . 1–24

Excursus I. "Friends" (φίλοι). 25–34

Excursus II. Christian Names. 35–45

Chapter IV. The Organization of the Christian Community, as bearing upon the Christian Mission. The Episcopate 46–63

Excursus. Ecclesiastical Organization and the Episcopate, from Pius to Constantine . 64–114

Chapter V. Counter-Movements: (1) Persecutions; (2) Hostile Verdicts—Literary Attacks . . 115–142

Conclusion. Reasons for and against the Acceptance of the Christian Religion . 142–146

BOOK IV.

THE SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Chapter I. General Evidence for the Extent and Intensity of the Spread of Christianity. The Main Stages in the History of the Mission. 147–182

PAGES

Chapter II. On the Inward Spread of Christianity 183–239

§ 1. Among the Cultured Classes (Aristocratic and Official) 183–192

§ 2. At Court 192–204

§ 3. In the Army 204–217

§ 4. Among Women 217–239

Chapter III. The Extension of Christianity down to 325 A.D. 240–446

I. Places in which Christian Communities or Christians can be traced as early as the First Century (previous to Trajan) . 242–244

II. Places where Christian Communities can be traced before 180 A.D. (*i.e.* before the Death of Marcus Aurelius) . . 244–246

III. Places where Christian Communities can be shown to have existed previous to 325 A.D. (Council of Nicæa); together with some brief account of the Spread of Christianity throughout the various Provinces 246–446

§ 1. Palestine 247–271

§ 2. Phœnicia 271–276

§ 3. Coele-Syria 276–291

§ 4. Cyprus 291–292

§ 5. Edessa and the East (Mesopotamia, Persia, Parthia, and India) . 292–300

§ 6. Arabia 300–304

§ 7. Egypt and the Thebais, Libya and Pentapolis 304–323

PAGES

§ 8. Cilicia 324–326
§ 9. Asia Minor in General . . 326–337
A. Cappadocia 338–341
B. Armenia, Diospontus, Paphlagonia, Pontus Polemoniacus . 342–353
C. Bithynia 353–355
D. Galatia, Phrygia, and Pisidia (with Lycaonia) . . . 356–364
E. Asia (Lydia, Mysia) and Caria 364–368
F. Lycia, Pamphylia, and Isauria . 368–369
§ 10. Crete and the Islands . . 370–371
§ 11. Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Epirus, Thessaly, Greece . . 371–376
§ 12. Mœsia and Pannonia, Noricum and Dalmatia 376–378
§ 13. The North and North-West Coasts of the Black Sea . . 378–379
§ 14. Rome, Middle and Lower Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia . . . 379–395
§ 15. Upper Italy and the Romagna . 395–398
§ 16. Gaul, Belgium, Germany, Rhætia 399–409
§ 17. England 410–411
§ 18. Africa, Numidia, Mauretania, and Tripolitana 411–435
§ 19. Spain 435–446

Appendix. The Spread of Christianity and the Spread of Mithraism 447–451

Chapter IV. Results 452–468

Index. (*a*) New Testament Passages . . . 469–472
(*b*) General 473–478
(*c*) Geographical 479–488

The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries

BOOK III.—*Continued.*

CHAPTER III.

THE NAMES OF CHRISTIAN BELIEVERS.

Jesus called those who gathered round him "disciples" (*μαθηταί*); he called himself the "teacher"[1] (this is historically certain), while those whom he had gathered addressed him as teacher,[2] and described themselves as disciples (just as the adherents of John the Baptist were also termed disciples of John). From this it follows that the relation of Jesus to his disciples during his lifetime was determined, not by the con-

[1] The saying addressed to the disciples in Matt. xxiii. 8 (*ὑμεῖς μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββεί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε*) is very noticeable. One would expect *μαθηταί* instead of *ἀδελφοί* here; but the latter is quite in place, for Jesus is seeking to emphasize the equality of all his disciples and their obligation to love one another. It deserves notice, however, that the apostles were not termed "disciples," or at least very rarely, with the exception of Paul.

[2] Parallel to this is the term *ἐπιστάτης*, which occurs more than once in Luke.

ception of messiah, but by that of teacher. As yet the messianic dignity of Jesus—only to be revealed at his return—remained a mystery of faith still dimly grasped, nor did Jesus himself have recourse to it until his entry into Jerusalem.

After the resurrection his disciples witnessed openly and confidently to the fact that Jesus was the messiah, but they still continued to call themselves "disciples" —which proves how tenacious names are when once they have been affixed. The twelve confidants of Jesus were called "the twelve disciples" (or, "the twelve").[1] From Acts (cp. i., vi., ix., xi., xiii.–xvi., xviii., xxi.) we learn that although, strictly speaking, "disciples" had ceased to be applicable, it was retained by Christians for one or two decades as a designation of themselves, especially by the Christians of Palestine.[2] Paul never employed it, however, and gradually, one observes, the name of *οἱ μαθηταί* (with the addition of *τοῦ κυρίου*) came to be exclusively applied to *personal* disciples of Jesus, *i.e.* in the first instance to the twelve, and thereafter to others also,[3]

[1] Οἱ *μαθηταί* is not a term exclusively reserved for the twelve in the primitive age. All Christians were called by this name. The term *ἡ μαθήτρια* also occurs (cp. Acts ix. 36, and Gosp. Pet. 50).

[2] In Acts xxi. 16 a certain Mnason is called *ἀρχαῖος μαθητής*, which implies perhaps that he is to be regarded as a personal disciple of Jesus, and at any rate that he was a disciple of the first generation. One also notes that, according to the source employed by Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xxix. 7), *μαθηταί* was the name of the Christians who left Jerusalem for Pella. I should not care to admit that Luke is following an unjustifiable archaism in using the term *μαθηταί* so frequently in Acts.

[3] Is not a restriction of the idea voiced as early as Matt. x. 42 (*ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ*)?

as in Papias, Irenæus, etc. In this way it became a title of honour for those who had themselves seen the Lord (and also for Palestinian Christians of the primitive age in general?), and who could therefore serve as evidence against heretics who subjected the person of Jesus to a docetic decomposition. Confessors and martyrs during the second and third centuries were also honoured with this high title of "disciples of the Lord." They too became, that is to say, *personal* disciples of the Lord. Inasmuch as they attached themselves to him by their confession and he to them (Matt. x. 32), they were promoted to the same rank as the primitive personal disciples of Jesus, being as near the Lord in glory as were the latter to him during his earthly sojourn.[1]

[1] During the period subsequent to Acts it is no longer possible, so far as I know, to prove the use of *μαθηταί* (without the addition of *τοῦ κυρίου* or *Χριστοῦ*) as a term used by all adherents of Jesus to designate themselves; that is, if we leave out of account, of course, all passages—and they are not altogether infrequent—in which the word is not technical. Even with the addition of *τοῦ κυρίου*, the term ceases to be a title for Christians in general by the second century.—One must not let oneself be misled by late apocryphal books, nor by the apologists of the second century. The latter often describe Christ as their teacher, and themselves (or Christians generally) as disciples, but this has no connection, or at best an extremely loose connection, with the primitive terminology. It is moulded, for apologetic reasons, upon the terminology of the philosophic schools, just as the apologists chose to talk about "dogmas" of the Christian teaching, and "theology" (see my *Dogmensgeschichte*, I.[3] pp. 482 f.; Eng. trans., ii. 176 f.). As everyone is aware, the apologists knew perfectly well that, strictly speaking, Christ was not a teacher, but rather lawgiver (*νομοθέτης*), law (*νόμος*), Logos (*λόγος*), Saviour (*σωτήρ*), and judge (*κριτής*), so that an expression like *κυριακὴ διδασκαλία*, or "the Lord's instructions" (apologists and Clem., *Strom.*, VI. xv. 124, VI. xviii. 165, VII. x. 57, VII. xv. 90, VII. xviii. 165), is not to be adduced

The term "disciples" fell into disuse, because it no longer expressed the relationship in which Christians now found themselves placed. It meant at once too little and too much. Consequently other terms arose, although these did not in every instance pass into technical titles.

as proof that the apologists considered Jesus as in reality their teacher. Rather more weight would attach to διδαχὴ κυρίου (the title of the well-known early catechism), and passages like 1 Clem. xiii. 1 (τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων = the word of the Lord Jesus which he spoke *when teaching*); Polyc. 2 (μνημονεύοντες ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων = remembering what the Lord said *as he taught*); Ptolem., *ad Flor.* v. (ἡ διδασκαλία τοῦ σωτῆρος); and *Apost. Constit.*, p. 25 (*Texte u. Unters.*, ii., part 5—προορῶντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ διδασκάλου ἡμῶν = the words of our *teacher*); p. 28 (ὅτε ᾔτησεν ὁ διδάσκαλος τὸν ἄρτον = when the *teacher* asked for bread); p. 30 (προέλεγεν ὅτε ἐδίδασκεν = he foretold when he *taught*). But, *a propos* of these passages, we have to recollect that the *Apostolic Constitutions* is a work of fiction, which makes the apostles its spokesmen (thus it is that Jesus is termed ὁ διδάσκαλος in the original document underlying the Constitutions, *i.e.* the disciples call him by this name in the fabricated document).—There are numerous passages to prove that martyrs and confessors were those, and those alone, to whom the predicate of "disciples of Jesus" was also attached even already, in the present age, since it was they who actually followed and imitated Jesus. Compare, *e.g.*, Ignat., *ad Ephes.* i. (ἐλπίζω ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν Ῥώμῃ θηριομαχῆσαι, ἵνα ἐπιτυχεῖν δυνηθῶ μαθητὴς εἶναι = my hope is to succeed in fighting with beasts at Rome, so that I may succeed in being a disciple); *ad Rom.* iv. (τότε ἔσομαι μαθητὴς ἀληθὴς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτε οὐδὲ τὸ σῶμά μου ὁ κόσμος ὄψεται = then shall I be a true disciple of Christ, when the world no longer sees my body); *ad Rom.* v. (ἐν τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον μαθητεύομαι = through their misdeeds I became more a disciple than ever); *Mart. Polyc.* xvii. (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ κυρίου ἀγαπῶμεν = we worship the Son of God, and love the martyrs as disciples and imitators of the Lord). When Novatian founded his puritan church, he seems to have tried to resuscitate the idea of every Christian being a disciple and imitator of Christ.

The Jews, in the first instance, gave their renegade compatriots special names of their own, in particular "Nazarenes," "Galileans," and probably also "Poor." But these titles really did not prevail except in small circles.[1]

The Christians called themselves "God's people," "Israel in spirit (*κατὰ πνεῦμα*)," "the seed of Abraham," "the chosen people," "the twelve tribes," "the elect,"

[1] See "the sect of the Nazarenes" (*ἡ τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσις*) in Acts xxiv. 5, where Paul is termed their *προστάτης* or ringleader. The name persisted in Palestine till the fourth century, and perhaps even later still (cp. Epiph., *Hær.* i., hom. l. *ad fin.*—*Ναζωραίων ὅ ἐστι Χριστιανῶν ὁ κληθεὶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων Χριστιανισμός* = the Nazarenes, that is, the Christians—as the Jews have called them). Even the Jewish Christians appear to have accepted it.—The first disciples of Jesus were described as Galileans (cp. Acts i. 11, ii. 7), which primarily was a geographical term to denote their origin, but was also intended to throw scorn on the disciples as semi-pagans. The name rarely became a technical term, however. Epictetus once employed it for Christians (Arrian, *Diss.*, IV. vii. 6). Then Julian resurrected it (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* iv.: *καινοτομεῖ ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς περὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν, Γαλιλαίους ἀντὶ Χριστιανῶν ὀνομάσας τε καὶ καλεῖσθαι νομοθετήσας . . . . ὄνομα* [*Γαλιλαῖοι*] *τῶν οὐκ εἰωθότων*) and employed it as a term of abuse, although in this as in other points he was only following in the footsteps of Maximinus Daza, or of his officer Theoteknus, an opponent of Christianity, who (according to the *Acta Theodoti Ancyrani*, c. xxxi.) dubbed Theodotus *προστάτης τῶν Γαλιλαίων*, or "the ringleader of the Galileans." We may assume that the Christians were already called "Galileans" in the anti-Christian writings which Daza caused to be circulated, although such a conjecture becomes untenable if (as Franchi de' Cavalieri holds) the Theoteknus of the *Acta Theodoti* is not the same as the Theoteknus mentioned by Eusebius in his Church-History, and if the *Acta* are to be taken as subsequent to Julian. The *Philopatris* of pseudo-Lucian, where "Galileans" also occurs, has nothing whatever to do with our present purpose, as it is merely a late Byzantine forgery. With the description of Christians as "Galileans," however, we may compare the title of "Phrygians" given to the Montanists.—The name "Ebionites"

"the servants of God," "believers," "saints," "brethren," and "the church of God."[1] Of these names the first seven (and others of a similar character) never became technical terms taken singly, but, so to speak, collectively. They show how the new community felt itself to be the heir of all the promises and privileges of the Jewish nation. At the same time, "the elect"[2] and "the servants of God"[3] came very near being technical expressions.

From the usage and vocabulary of Paul, Acts, and later writings,[4] it follows that "believers" (πιστοί) was

(or poor) is not quite obvious, but I am more and more convinced that the Christian believers most likely got this name from their Jewish opponents simply because they *were* poor, and that they accepted the designation. Recently, however, Hilgenfeld has followed the church-fathers, Tertullian, Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xxx. 18), etc., in holding that the Ebionites must be traced back to a certain Ebion, who founded the sect; Dalman also recommends this derivation.—Technically, the Christians were never described as "the poor" throughout the empire, for the passage in Minuc., *Octav.* xxxvi., is not evidence enough to establish such a theory.

[1] So far as I know, no title was ever derived from the name of "Jesus" in the primitive days of Christianity.—On the question whether Christians adopted the name of "Friends" as a technical title, see the first Excursus at the close of this chapter.

[2] Cp. *Minut. Felix* xi.

[3] Cp. the New Testament, and especially the "Shepherd" of Hermas.

[4] Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff is perhaps right in adducing also *Min. Felix* xiv., where Cæcilius calls Octavius "pistorum praecipuus et postremus philosophus" ("chief of believers and lowest of philosophers"). "Pistores" here does not mean "millers," but is equivalent to πιστῶν. From Celsus also one may conclude that the term πιστοί was technical (Orig., *c. Cels.*, I. ix.). The pagans employed it as an opprobrious name for their opponents, while the Christians wore it as a name of honour, though they were pronounced people of mere "belief" instead of people of intelligence and knowledge, *i.e.* people who not only were credulous

a technical term. In assuming the name of "believers" (which originated, we may conjecture, on the soil of Gentile Christianity), Christians felt that the decisive and cardinal thing in this religion was the message which had made them what they were, a message which was nothing else than the preaching of the *one* God, of his son Jesus Christ, and of the life to come.

The three characteristic titles, however, are those of "the saints," "brethren," and "the church of God," all of which hang together. The abandonment of the term "disciples" for these self-chosen titles[1] marks the most significant advance made by those who believed in Jesus (cp. Weizsäcker, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 f.; Eng. trans., i. pp. 43 f.). They took the name of

but also believed what was absurd (see Lucian's verdict on the Christians in *Proteus Peregrinus*).—In Noricum an inscription has been found, dating from the fourth century (CIL, vol. iii. Supplem. Pars Poster., No. 13529), which describes a woman as "Christiana fidelis."

[1] They are the usual expressions in Paul, but he was by no means the first to employ them; on the contrary, he must have taken them over from the Jewish Christian communities in Palestine. At the same time they acquired a deeper content in his teaching. In my opinion it is impossible to maintain the view (which some would derive from the New Testament) that the Christians at Jerusalem were called "the saints," κατ' ἐξοχήν, and it is equally erroneous to conjecture that the Christianity of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages embraced a special and inner circle of people to whom the title of "saints" was exclusively applied. This cannot be made out, either from 1 Tim. v. 10, or from Heb. xiii. 24, or from Did. iv. 2, or from any other passage. The expression "the holy apostles" in Eph. iii. 5 is extremely surprising; I do not think it likely that Paul used such a phrase. —The earliest attribute of the word "church," be it noted, was "holy"; cp. the collection of passages in Hahn-Harnack's *Bibliothek der Symbole*[(3)], p. 88, and also the expressions "holy people" (ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς ἅγιος), "holy priesthood."

"saints," because they were sanctified by God and for God through the holy Spirit sent by Jesus, and because they were conscious of being truly holy and partakers in the future glory despite all the sins that daily clung to them.[1] It remains the technical term applied by Christians to one another till after the middle of the second century (cp. Clem. Rom., Hermas, the Didachê, etc.); thereafter it gradually disappears, as Christians had no longer the courage to call themselves "saints," after all the experiences which they had undergone. Besides, what really distinguished Christians from one another by this time was the difference between the clergy and the laity (or the leaders and the led), so that the name "saints" became quite obliterated, being only recalled in the hard times of persecution. In its place, "holy orders" arose (martyrs, confessors, ascetics, and finally—during the third century—the bishops), while "holy media" (sacraments), whose fitful influence covered Christians who were personally unholy, assumed still greater prominence than in the first century. People were no longer conscious of being personally holy,[2] but then they had holy

[1] The actual and sensible guarantees of holiness lay in the holy media, the "charismata," and the power of expelling demons. These possessed not merely a real but a personal character of their own. For the former, see 1 Cor. vii. 14: ἡγίασται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν.

[2] The church formed by Novatian in the middle of the third century called itself "the pure" (καθαροί), but we cannot tell whether this title was an original formation or the resuscitation of an older name. We shall not enter into the question of the names taken by separate Christian sects and circles (such as the Gnostics, the Spiritualists, etc.)

martyrs, holy ascetics, holy priests, holy ordinances, holy writings, and a holy doctrine.

Closely bound up with the name of "saints" was that of "brethren" (and "sisters"), the former denoting the Christians' relationship to God and to the future life (or βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, the kingdom of God), the latter the new relationship in which they felt themselves placed towards their fellow-men, and, above all, towards their fellow-believers (cp. also the not infrequent title of "brethren in the Lord"). After Paul, this title became so common that the pagans soon grew familiar with it, ridiculing and besmirching it, but unable, for all that, to evade the impression which it made. For the term did correspond to the conduct of Christians.[1] They termed themselves a brotherhood (ἀδελφότης; cp. 1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9, etc.) as well as brethren (ἀδελφοί), and to understand how fixed and frequent was the title, to understand how truly it answered to their life and conduct,[2] one has only to study, not merely the New Testament writings (where

[1] See the opinions of pagans quoted by the apologists, especially Tertull., *Apol.* xxxix., and Minuc., *Octav.*, ix., xxxi., with Lucian's *Prot. Peregrinus.* Tertullian avers that pagans were amazed at the brotherliness of Christians: "see how they love one another!"—In pagan guilds the name of "brother" is also found, but—so far I am aware—it is not common. From Acts xxii. 5, xxviii. 21, we must infer that the Jews also called each other "brethren," but the title cannot have had the significance for them that it possessed for Christians. Furthermore, as Jewish teachers call their pupils "children" (or "sons" and "daughters"), and are called by them in turn "father," these appellations also occur very frequently in the relationship between the Christian apostles and teachers and their pupils (cp. the numerous passages in Paul, Barnabas, etc.).

[2] Details on this point, as well as on the import of this fact for the Christian mission, in Book II. Chap. IV.

Jesus himself employed it and laid great emphasis upon it [1]), but Clemens Romanus, the Didachê, and the writings of the apologists.[2] Yet even the name of "the brethren," though it outlived that of "the saints," lapsed after the close [3] of the third century; or rather, it was only ecclesiastics who really continued to call each other "brethren," [4] and when a priest gave the title of "brother" to a layman, it denoted a special mark of honour. "Brethren" ("fratres") survived only in sermons, but confessors were at liberty to address ecclesiastics and even bishops by this title (cp. Cypr., *ep.* liii.).

Since Christians in the apostolic age felt themselves to be "saints" and "brethren," and, in this sense, to be the true Israel and at the same time God's new creation,[5] they required a solemn title to bring out their complete and divinely appointed character and unity. As "brotherhood" (ἀδελφότης, see above) was

[1] Cp. Matt. xxiii. 8 (see above, p. 1), and xii. 48, where Jesus says of the disciples, ἰδοὺ ἡ μητήρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. Thus they are not merely brethren, but *his* brethren.

[2] Apologists of a Stoic cast, like Tertullian (*Apol.* xxxix.), did not confine the name of "brethren" to their fellow-believers, but extended it to all men: "Fratres etiam vestri sumus, iure naturae matris unius" ("We are your brethren also, in virtue of our common mother Nature").

[3] It still occurs, though rarely, in the third century; cp., *e.g.*, the *Acta Pionii* ix. Theoretically, of course, the name still survived for a considerable time; cp., *e.g.*, Lactant., *Div. Inst.*, v. 15: "nec alia causa est cur nobis invicem fratrum nomen impertiamus, nisi quia pares esse nos credimus" [vol. i. p. 208].

[4] By the third century, however, they had also begun to style each other "dominus."

[5] On the titles of "a new people" and "a third race," see Book II. Chap. VI.

too one-sided, the name they chose was that of "church" or "the church of God" (ἐκκλησία, ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ). This was a masterly stroke. It was the work,[1] not of Paul, nor even earlier of Jesus, but of the Palestinian communities, which described themselves as קָהָל. Originally it was beyond question a collective term[2]; it was the most solemn expression of the Jews for their worship[3] as a collective body, and as such it was taken over by the Christians. But ere long it was applied to the individual communities, and then again to the general meeting for worship. Thanks to this many-sided usage, together with its religious colouring ("the church called by God") and the possibilities of personification which it offered, the conception and the term alike rapidly

[1] Paul evidently found it in circulation; the Christian communities in Jerusalem and Judæa already styled themselves ἐκκλησίαι (Gal. i. 22). Jesus did not coin the term; for it is only put into his lips in Matt. xvi. 18 and xviii. 17, both of which passages are more than suspect from a critical standpoint (see Holtzmann, *ad loc.*); and, moreover, all we know of his preaching well-nigh excludes the possibility that he conceived the idea of creating a special ἐκκλησία (so Matt. xvi. 18), or that he ever had in view the existence of a number of ἐκκλησίαι (so Matt. xviii. 17).

[2] This may be inferred from the Pauline usage of the term itself, apart from the fact that the particular application of all such terms is invariably later than their general meaning. In Acts xii. 1, Christians are first described as οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[3] קהל (usually rendered ἐκκλησία in LXX.) denotes the community in relation to God, and consequently is more sacred than the profaner עֵדָה (regularly translated by συναγωγή in the LXX.) The acceptance of ἐκκλησία is thus intelligible for the same reason as that of "Israel," "seed of Abraham," etc. Among the Jews ἐκκλησία lagged far behind συναγωγή in practical use, and this was all in favour of the Christians and their adoption of the term.

came to the front. Its acquisition rendered the capture of the term "synagogue"[1] a superfluity, and, once the inner cleavage had taken place, the very neglect of the latter title served to distinguish Christians sharply from Judaism and its religious gatherings even in terminology. From the outset the Gentile Christians learned to think of the new religion as a "church" and as "churches." This did not originally involve an element of authority, but such an element lies hidden from the first in any spiritual magnitude which puts itself forward as at once an ideal and an actual fellowship of men. It possesses regulations and traditions of its own, special powers and forms of organization, and these become authoritative; withal it supports the individual and at the same time guarantees to him the content of its testimony. Thus as early as 1 Tim. iii. 15 we read: *οἶκος θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.* Most important of all, however, was the fact that *ἐκκλησία* was conceived of, in the first instance, not simply as an earthly but as a heavenly and transcendental entity. He who belonged to the *ἐκκλησία* ceased to have the rights of a citizen on

[1] On the employment of this term by Christians, see my note on Herm., *Mand.* xi. It was not nervously eschewed, but it never became technical, apart from two cases of its occurrence. On the other hand, it is said of the Jewish Christians in Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 18, "they have presbyters and heads of synagogues. They call their church a synagogue and not a church; only, they are proud of no name but Christ's" (*πρεσβυτέρους οὗτοι ἔχουσι καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους· συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν· τῷ Χριστῷ δὲ ὀνόματι μόνον σεμνύνονται*). Still, one may doubt if the Jewish Christians really foreswore the name קהל (*ἐκκλησία*); that they called their gatherings and places of meeting *συναγωγαί*, may be admitted.

earth;[1] instead of these he acquired an assured citizenship in heaven. This transcendental meaning of the term still retained vigour and vitality during the second century, but in the course of the third it fell more and more into the background.[2]

During the course of the second century the term ἐκκλησία acquired the attribute of "catholic" (in addition to that of "holy"). This predicate does not contain anything which implies a secularisation of the church, for "catholic" originally meant Christendom as a whole in contrast to individual churches (ἐκκλησία καθολική = πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία). The conception of "all the churches" is thus identical with that of "the church in general." But a certain dogmatic element did exist from the very outset in the conception of the general church, as people imagined this church had been diffused by the apostles over all the earth. They were persuaded, therefore, that only what existed everywhere throughout the church could be true, and at the same time absolutely true, so that the conceptions of "all Christendom," "Christianity spread over all the earth," and "the true church," came to be regarded at a pretty early period as identical. In this way the term "catholic" acquired a pregnant meaning,

[1] The chosen designation of Christians as "strangers and sojourners" became almost technical in the first century (cp. the Epistles of Paul, 1 Peter, and Hebrews), and παροικία (with παροικεῖν = to sojourn) became actually a technical term for the individual community in the world (cp. also Herm., *Simil. I.*, on this).

[2] Till far down into the third century (cp. the usage of Cyprian) the word "secta" was employed by Christians quite ingenuously to denote their fellowship. It was not technical, of course, but entirely a neutral term.

and one which in the end was both dogmatic and political. As this was not innate but an innovation, it is not unsuitable to speak of pre-catholic and catholic Christianity. The term "catholic church" occurs first of all in Ignatius (*Smyrn.*, viii. 2: ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω· ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία), who writes: "Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be; just as wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the catholic church." Here, however, the words do not yet denote a new conception of the church, in which it is presented as an empirical and authoritative society. In *Mart. Polyc. Inscr.*, xvi. 2, xix. 2, the word is probably an interpolation ("catholic" being here equivalent to "orthodox": ἡ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία). From Iren., iii. 15. 2 ("Valentiniani eos qui sunt ab ecclesia 'communes' et 'ecclesiasticos' dicunt" = "The Valentinians call those who belong to the Church by the name of 'communes' and 'ecclesiastici'") it follows that the orthodox Christians were called "catholics" and "ecclesiastics" at the period of the Valentinian heresy. Irenæus himself does not employ the term; but the thing is there (cp. i. 10. 2; ii. 9. 1, etc.; similarly Serapion in Euseb., *H.E.*, v. 19, πᾶσα ἡ ἐν κόσμῳ ἀδελφότης). After the *Mart. Polyc.* the term "catholic," as a description of the orthodox and visible church, occurs in the Muratorian fragment (where "catholica" stands without "ecclesia" at all, as is frequently the case in later years throughout the West), in an anonymous writer (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16. 9), in Tertullian (*e.g.*, *de praescript.*, xxvi. 30; *adv. Marc.*, iv. 4, iii. 22), in Clem. Alex. (*Strom.*, vii. 17, 106 f.), in Hippolytus (*Philos.*, ix. 12), in *Mart. Pionii* (2. 9.

13. 19), in Pope Cornelius (Cypr., *epist.*, xlix. 2), and in Cyprian. The expression "catholica traditio" occurs in Tertullian (*de monog.* ii.), "fides catholica" in Cyprian (*ep.* xxv.), κανὼν καθολικός in *Mart. Polyc.* (Mosq. *ad fin.*), and Cyprian (*ep.*, lxx. 1), and "catholica fides et religio" in *Mart. Pionii* (18). Elsewhere the word appears in different connections throughout the early Christian literature. In the Western symbols the addition of "catholica" crept in at a comparatively late period, *i.e.* at the earliest in the third century. In the early Roman symbol it does not occur.

We now come to the name "Christians," which became the cardinal title of the faith. The Roman authorities certainly employed it from the days of Trajan downwards (cp. Pliny and the rescripts, the "cognitiones de Christianis"), and probably even forty or fifty years earlier (1 Pet. iv. 16; Tacitus), whilst it was by this name that the adherents of the new religion were known among the common people (Tacitus; cp. also the well-known passage in Suetonius).

Luke has told us where this name arose. After describing the foundation of the (Gentile Christian) church at Antioch, he proceeds (xi. 26): χρηματίσαι πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς [Χρηστιανούς]. It is not necessary to suppose that the name was given immediately after the establishment of the church, but we need not assume that any considerable interval elapsed between the one fact and the other.[1] Luke

[1] In my opinion, the doubts cast by Baur and Lipsius upon this statement of the book of Acts are not of serious moment. Adjectival formations in -ιανος are no doubt Latin, and indeed late Latin

does not tell us who gave the name, but he indicates it clearly enough.[1] It was not the Christians (otherwise he would not have written *χρηματίσαι*), for they simply could not have given it to themselves. The essentially inexact nature of the verbal form precludes any such idea. And for the same reason it could not have originated with the Jews. It was among the pagans that the title arose, among pagans who heard that a man called "Christ" [Chrestus] was the lord and master of the new sect. Accordingly they struck out[2] the name of "Christians," as though "Christ" were a proper name, just as they spoke of "Herodiani,"

formations (in Kühner-Blass's grammar they are not so much as noticed); but even in the first century they must have permeated the Greek vernacular by means of ordinary intercourse. In the New Testament itself we find *Ἡρωδιανοί* (Mark iii. 6, xii. 13, Matt. xxii. 16), Justin writes *Μαρκιανοί*, *Οὐαλεντινιανοί*, *Βασιλιδιανοί*, *Σατορνιλιανοί* (*Dial.* xxxv.), and similar formations are of frequent occurrence subsequently. If one wishes to be very circumspect, one may conjecture that the name was first coined by the Roman magistrates in Antioch, and then passed into currency among the common people. The Christians themselves hesitated for long to use the name; yet this is anything but surprising, and therefore it cannot be brought forward as an argument against the early origin of the term.

[1] The reason why he did not speak out clearly was perhaps because the pagan origin of the name was already felt by him to be a drawback. But it is not necessary to suppose such a thing.

[2] Possibly they intended the name originally to be written "Chrestus" (not "Christus"), an error which was widely spread among opponents of Christianity during the second century; cp. Justin's *Apol.*, I. iv., Theophil., *ad Autol.*, I. i., Tert., *Apol.* iii., Lact., *Instit.*, iv. 7. 5, with Suetonius, *Claud.* 25, and Tacitus (see below). But this conjecture is not necessary. Pagans certainly had a pretty common proper name in "Chrestus" (but no "Christus"), so that they may have thought from the very first that a man of this name was the founder of the sect.

"Marciani," etc.[1] At first, of course, Christians did not adopt the title. It does not occur in Paul or anywhere in the New Testament as a designation applied by Christians to themselves, for in the only two passages[2] where it does occur it is quoted from the lips of an opponent, and even in the apostolic fathers (so-called) we seek it in vain. The sole exception is Ignatius,[3] who employs it quite frequently; a fact which serves admirably to corroborate the narrative of Acts, for Ignatius belonged to Antioch.[4] Thus the name not only originated in Antioch, but, so far as we know, it was there that it first became used by Christians as a title. By the days of Trajan the Christians of Asia Minor had also been in possession of this title for a considerable period, but its general vogue cannot be dated earlier than the close of Hadrian's reign or that of Pius. Tertullian already employs it as if it had been given by the Christians to themselves.[5]

[1] "Christians" therefore simply means adherents of a man called Christ.

[2] 1 Pet. iv. 16: *μή τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης . . . . εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός*, referring obviously to official tituli criminum. In Acts xxvi. 28 Agrippa observes, *ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι.*

[3] He employs it even as an adjective (*Trall.* vi.: *Χριστιανὴ τροφή* = Christian food), and coins the new term *Χριστιανισμός* (*Magn.* x., *Rom.* iii., *Philad.* vi.).

[4] Luke, too, was probably an Antiochene by birth (cp. the Argumentum to his gospel, and also Eusebius), so that in this way he knew the origin of the name.

[5] *Apol.* iii: "Quid novi, si aliqua disciplina de magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? nonne philosophi de autoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici?" ("Is there anything novel in a sect drawing a name for its adherents from its master? Are not philosophers called after the founder of their philosophies—Platonists, Epicureans, and Pythagoreans?")

A word in closing on the well-known passage from Tacitus (*Annal.*, xv. 44). It is perfectly certain that the persecution mentioned here was really a persecution of Christians (and not of Jews), the only doubtful point being whether the use of "Christiani" ("quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat") is not a *hysteron proteron*. Yet even this doubt seems to me unjustified. If Christians were called by this name in Antioch about 40–45 A.D., there is no obvious reason why the name should not have been known in Rome by 64 A.D., even although the Christians did not spread it themselves, but were only followed by it as by their shadow. Nor does Tacitus (or his source) aver that the name was used by Christians for their own party; he says the very opposite; it was the people who thus described them. Hitherto, however, the statement of Tacitus has appeared rather unintelligible, for he begins by ascribing the appellation of "Christians" to the common people, and then goes on to relate that the "autor nominis," or author of the name, was Christ, in which case the common people did a very obvious and natural thing when they called Christ's followers "Christians." Why, then, does Tacitus single out the appellation of "Christian" as a popular epithet? This is an enigma which I once proposed to solve by supposing that the populace gave the title to Christians in an obscene or opprobrious sense. I bethought myself of "crista," or of the term "panchristarii," which (so far as I know) occurs only once in Arnobius ii. 38: "Quid fullones, lanarios, phrygiones, cocos, panchristarios, muliones, lenones, lanios, meretrices (What of the fullers, wool-workers, embroiderers,

cooks, confectioners, muleteers, pimps, butchers, prostitutes)? Tacitus, we might conjecture, aims at suggesting this meaning, while at the same time he explains the real origin of the term in question. But this hypothesis was a precarious one, and in my judgment the enigma has now been solved by means of a fresh collation of the Tacitus MS. (see G. Andresen, *Wochenschr. f. klass. Philologie*, 1902, No. 28, col. 780 f.), which shows, as I am convinced from the facsimile, that the original reading was "Chrestianos," and that this was subsequently corrected (though "Christus" and not "Chrestus" is the term employed *ad loc.*). This clears up the whole matter. The populace, as Tacitus says, called this sect "Chrestiani," while he himself is better informed (like Pliny, who also writes "Christian"), and silently corrects the mistake in the spelling of the names, by accurately designating its author (autor nominis) as "Christus." Blass had anticipated this solution by a conjecture of his own in the passage under discussion, and the event has proved that he was correct. The only point which remains to be noticed is the surprising tense of "appellabat." Why did not Tacitus write "appellat," we may ask? Was it because he wished to indicate that everyone nowadays was well aware of the origin of the name?

One name still falls to be considered, a name which of course never became really technical, but was (so to speak) semi-technical; I mean that of στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ (miles Christi, a soldier of Christ). With Paul this metaphor had already become so common that it was employed in the most diverse ways; compare the great descriptions in 2 Cor. x. 3–6

(στρατευόμεθα -- τὰ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας — πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων — λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες — αἰχμαλωτίζοντες), and the elaborate sketch in Ephes. vi. 10–18, with 1 Thess. v. 8 and 1 Cor. ix. 7, noting also how Paul describes his fellow-prisoners as "fellow-captives" (Rom. xvi. 7; Col. iv. 10; Philemon 23), and his fellow-workers as "fellow-soldiers" (Phil. ii. 25; Philemon 2). We come across the same figure again in the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. i. 18: ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν; 2 Tim. ii. 3 f.: συνκακοπάθησον ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Ἰ. Χ. οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀθλήσῃ τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ; 2 Tim. iii. 6: αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια). Thereafter it never lost currency,[1] becoming so naturalized[2] among the

[1] Cp., *e.g.*, Ignat., *ad Polyc.* vi. (a passage in which the technical Latinisms are also very remarkable): ἀρέσκετε ᾧ στρατεύεσθε, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὰ ὀψώνια κομίσεσθε· μήτις ὑμῶν δεσέρτωρ εὑρεθῇ. τὸ βάπτισμα ὑμῶν μενέτω ὡς ὅπλα, ἡ πίστις ὡς περικεφαλαία, ἡ ἀγάπη ὡς δόρυ, ἡ ὑπομονὴ ὡς πανοπλία· τὰ δεσπόσιτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν, ἵνα τὰ ἀκκεπτα ὑμῶν ἄξια κομίσησθε ("Please him for whom ye fight, and from whom ye shall receive your pay. Let none of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism abide as your shield, your faith as a helmet, your love as a spear, your patience as a panoply. Let your actions be your deposit, that ye may receive your due assets"); cp. also *ad Smyrn.* i. (ἵνα ἄρῃ σύσσημον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, "that he might raise an ensign to all eternity").

[2] Clemens Romanus's work is extremely characteristic in this direction, even by the end of the first century. He not only employs military figures (*e.g.*, xxi.: μὴ λιποτακτεῖν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ = we are not to be deserters from his will; cp. xxviii.: τῶν αὐτομολούντων ἀπ' αὐτοῦ = running away from him), but (xxxvii.) presents the Roman military service as a model and type for Christians: στρατευσώμεθα οὖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας ἐν τοῖς ἀμώμοις προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ· κατανοήσωμεν τοὺς στρατευομένους τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν· πῶς εὐτάκτως, πῶς εὐείκτως, πῶς ὑποτεταγμένως ἐπιτελοῦσιν τὰ διατασσόμενα· οὐ πάντες εἰσὶν ἔπαρχοι οὐδὲ χιλίαρχοι οὐδὲ ἑκατόνταρχοι

Latins especially (as a title for the martyrs pre-eminently, but also for Christians in general), that "soldiers of Christ" (milites Christi) almost became a technical term with them for Christians; cp. the writings of Tertullian, and particularly the correspondence of Cyprian—where hardly one letter fails to describe Christians as "soldiers of God" (milites dei), or "soldiers of Christ" (milites Christi), and where Christ is also called the "imperator" of Christians.[1] The preference shown for this figure by

οὐδὲ πεντακόνταρχοι οὐδὲ τὸ καθεξῆς, ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι τὰ ἐπιτασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων ἐπιτελεῖ ("Let us then enlist, brethren, in his flawless ordinances with entire earnestness. Let us mark those who enlist under our commanders, how orderly, how readily, how obediently, they carry out their injunctions; all of them are not prefects or captains over a hundred men, or over fifty, or so forth, but every man in his proper rank carries out the orders of the king and the commanders").

[1] Cp. *ep.* xv. 1 (to the martyrs and confessors): "Nam cum omnes milites Christi custodire oportet praecepta imperatoris sui [so Lact., *Instit.*, vi. 8 and vii. 27], tunc vos magis praeceptis eius obtemperare plus convenit" ("For while it behoves all the soldiers of Christ to observe the instructions of their commander, it is the more fitting that you should obey his instructions"). The expression "camp of Christ" (castra Christi) is particularly common in Cyprian; cp. also *ep.* liv. 1 for the expression "unitas sacramenti" in connection with the military figure. Cp. pseudo-Augustine (Aug., *Opp.* v., App. p. 150): "Milites Christi sumus et stipendium ab ipso donativumque percepimus" ("We are Christ's soldiers, and from him we have received our pay and presents").—I need not say that the Christian's warfare was invariably figurative in primitive Christianity (in sharp contrast to Islam). It was left to Tertullian, in his *Apology*, to trifle with the idea that Christians might conceivably take up arms in certain circumstances against the Romans, like the Parthians and Marcomanni; yet even he merely played with the idea, for he knew perfectly well, as indeed he expressly declares, that Christians were permitted, not to kill (occidere), but only to let themselves be killed (occidi).

Christians of the West, and their incorporation of it in definite representations, may be explained by their more aggressive and at the same time thoroughly practical temper. The currency lent to the figure was reinforced by the fact that "sacramentum" in the West (*i.e.* any μυστήριον or mystery, and also anything sacred) was an extremely common term, while baptism in particular, or the solemn vow taken at baptism, was also designated a "sacramentum." Being a military term (= the military oath), it led all Western Christians to feel that they must be soldiers of Christ, owing to their sacrament, and the probability is, as has been recently shown (by Zahn, *Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1899, pp. 28 f.), that this usage explains the description of the pagans as "pagani." It can be demonstrated that the latter term was already in use (during the early years of Valentinian I.; cp. Theodos., *Cod.* xvi., 2. 18) long before the development of Christianity had gone so far as to enable all non-Christians to be termed "villagers," so that the title must rather be taken in the sense of "civilians" (for which there is outside evidence) as opposed to "milites" or soldiers. Non-Christians are people who have not taken the oath of service to God or Christ, and who consequently have no part in the sacrament. They are mere "pagani."[1]

[1] For the interpretation of paganus as "pagan" we cannot point to Tertull., *de corona* xi. (perpetiendum pro deo, quod aeque fides pagana condixit = for God we must endure what even civic loyalty has also borne; apud Jesum tam miles est paganus fidelis, quam paganus est miles fidelis = with Jesus the faithful citizen is a soldier, just as the faithful soldier is a citizen; cp. *de pallio* iv.), for "fides pagana" here means, not pagan faith or loyalty (as one

Pagans in part caught up the names of Christians as they heard them on the latter's lips,[1] but of course they used most commonly the title which they had

might suppose), but the duty of faith in those who do not belong to the military profession, as is plain from the subsequent discussion. Though Ulphilas, Prudentius, and Orosius all maintain the ordinary explanation of the origin of this term, I cannot think it is correct, unlike Schubert in recent days (*Lehrb. d. K. Gesch.*, i. p. 477). About 300 A.D.—to leave out the inscription in CIL, x. 2, 7112—the non-Christian religions could not as yet be designated as "peasant" or "rural" religions —The military figure originated in the great struggle which every Christian had to wage against Satan and the demons (Eph. vi. 12: *οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορους τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*). Once the State assumed a hostile attitude towards Christians, the figure of the military calling and conflict naturally arose also in this connection. God looks down, says Cyprian (*ep.* lxxvi. 4), upon his troops: "Gazing down on us amid the conflict of his Name, he approves those who are willing, aids the fighters, crowns the conquerors," etc. (in congressione nominis sui desuper spectans volentes conprobat, adiuvat dimicantes, vincentes coronat, etc.). Nor are detailed descriptions of the military figure awanting; cp., *e.g.*, the seventy-seventh letter addressed to Cyprian (ch. ii.): tu tuba canens dei milites, caelestibus armis instructos, ad congressionis proelium excitasti et in acie prima, spiritali gladio diabolum interfecisti, agmina quoque fratrum hinc et inde verbis tuis composuisti, ut invidiae inimico undique tenderentur et cadavera ipsius publici hostis et nervi concisi calcarentur ("As a sounding trumpet, thou hast roused the soldiers of God, equipped with heavenly armour, for the shock of battle, and in the forefront thou hast slain the devil with the sword of the Spirit; on this side and on that thou hast marshalled the lines of the brethren by thy words, so that snares might be laid in all directions for the foe, the sinews of the common enemy be severed, and carcases trodden under foot"). The African Acts of the Martyrs are full of military expressions and metaphors; see, *e.g.*, the *Acta Saturnini et Dativi*, xv. (Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 420).

[1] Celsus, for instance, speaks of the church as "the great church" (to distinguish it from the smaller Christian sects).

coined themselves, viz. that of "Christians," alongside of which we find nicknames and sobriquets like "Galileans," "ass-worshippers" (Tert., *Apol.* xvi., cp. *Minut.*), "magicians" (*Acta Theclae*, Tertull.), "Third race," "sarmenticii" and "semi-axii" (stake-bound, faggot-circled; Tert., *Apol.* i.).[1]

Closely bound up with the "names" of Christians is the discussion of the question whether individual Christians got new names as Christians, or how Christians stood with regard to ordinary pagan names during the first three centuries. The answer to this will be found in the second Excursus appended to the present chapter.

[1] Terms drawn derisively from the methods of death inflicted upon Christians.

EXCURSUS I.[1]

FRIENDS (φίλοι).

FRIENDSHIP, in the deepest and most comprehensive sense of the term, is the twin-sister of that knowledge which forms the supreme and engrossing business of a lifetime. Both arose together. Both had Eros as their common father. The history of the Greek schools of philosophy is at the same time the history of friendship. No one ever spoke more nobly and warmly of friendship than Aristotle himself, and never has it been more vividly realized than amid the schools of the Pythagoreans and Epicureans. The former school might even go the length of a community of goods, but still they were outstripped by the philosopher of Samos with his injunction: μὴ κατατίθεσθαι τὰς οὐσίας εἰς τὸ κοινόν· ἀπιστούντων γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον: εἰ δ' ἀπίστων, οὐδὲ φίλων ("Put not your property into a common holding, for that implies a mutual distrust; and when people distrust each other, friends they cannot be"). The ethics of the Porch, based on the absence of any wants in the perfectly wise man, certainly did not leave any room for friend-

[1] The little essay which I insert at this point was printed for private circulation in 1899. It appears now in somewhat altered form.

ship, but (as so often is the case) the Stoic broke through the theory of his school at this point, and Seneca was not the only Stoic moralist who glorified friendship and proved it was morally essential. People were still moved by the pattern set before them in the intercourse of Socrates with pupils who were at the same time his friends; men could not forget how he lived with these friends, how he laboured for them and remained accessible to them up to the hour of his death, and how everything he taught them came home to them as a friend's counsel.

No wonder that the Epicureans, like the Pythagoreans before them, simply called themselves "friends." It formed at once the simplest and the deepest expression for that inner tie into which people found themselves transplanted when they entered the fellowship of the school. No matter whether one thought of the common reverence felt for the master, or of the community of sentiment and aims among the members, or of their mutual aid, the relationship in every case was covered by the term "friendship." And even where the name was not in use, the thing itself was there. Let the sophist see to himself. As for the philosopher, he needed "friends" and was himself a "friend."

From the days of the emperor Claudius onwards, "schools" which had hitherto been unknown spread with extraordinary rapidity over the Roman empire from Palestine, schools which superficially seemed either a new development of the synagogal system, or societies of "philosophers," embracing old women and slaves, or associations of excited and therefore of

dangerous fools. These were the Christian *ecclesiæ*. One thing was plain, however, even to the dimmest vision and the most determined dislike. And that was the strong and even unexampled fellow-feeling which held these guilds together and animated their members. "They have all things in common": "they make light of any expense whatever in their mutual services": "they treat each other as brothers and sisters"—such were the opinions of their conduct to be heard all over the empire. And these opinions corresponded to the self-consciousness of the people, to whom they applied. Deep into their souls the conviction had sunk that their whole course of life must be regulated by the limitless duty of love, especially towards those who shared their faith, and also that they were to stand towards one another in the capacity of *friends*. The question is, did they also style themselves outright as "friends"?

In the New Testament itself, different designations of the adherents of Jesus are often to be met with, such as "the saints," "the elect," "the disciples," "the brethren," etc., besides the name of "Christians," which arose first among their opponents at Antioch and was subsequently taken over by themselves. But if we look for the name of "the friends" in the New Testament, the results of our search are so scanty that it is doubtful if in this case we are dealing with a technical title at all. Strictly speaking, only two passages fall to be noted.[1] In that section of Acts which has been composed by a fellow-traveller and eye-witness of the apostle Paul's voyage to Rome, we read (xxvii. 3): τῇ τε ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν εἰς

[1] Not a single relevant passage occurs throughout Paul's epistles.

Σιδῶνα, φιλανθρώπως τε ὁ Ἰούλιος τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος ἐπέτρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν. Does οἱ φίλοι here mean Christians in general or some special friends of Paul? And if the first meaning is correct, are we to admit that the usage of the word is technical? Neither question, in my opinion, can be answered with absolute certainty. But as regards the former, it is extremely unlikely that the historian meant special friends of Paul, otherwise he would probably have put the matter more definitely, as he has done, *e.g.*, in xxi. 6. Besides, the expression itself must, in this event, have been more precise. We must assume, then, that οἱ φίλοι here is equivalent to οἱ ἀδελφοί, which recurs so frequently in Acts (see parallels of especial significance in ix. 30, x. 23, xi. 29, xv. 32, 33, 36, 40, xvii, 10, 14, xviii. 18, 27, and above all, xxi. 7, 17, xxviii. 15). Yet even if Luke means Christians in general by this expression, it does not follow by any means from this solitary passage that the term was technical. This writer, with his classical culture, might for once choose a form of expression which could not be misunderstood, without being led thereto by any fixed linguistic usage.

The little third epistle of John ends (ver. 15) with these words, ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ φίλοι· ἀσπάζου τοὺς φίλους κατ' ὄνομα. Here one might think of greetings sent by all the Christians in the company of John to all the Christians in the church of Gaius (to whom the epistle is addressed), in which case we would recognise in οἱ φίλοι a technical description of Christians in general. But the words "by name" (κατ' ὄνομα) rather point to an inner circle, and this

explanation becomes a certainty if one takes into consideration the contents of the epistle. It reveals a fissure in the church of Gaius. A section of its members, headed by the president, is hostile to John. Consequently the latter cannot have meant by *οἱ φίλοι* any but those members of the church who were friendly to himself, whilst the friends who send the greeting are not the entire body of Christians in Ephesus, but a smaller circle grouped round John. Which is again one proof, corroborated by the negative evidence derived from the above Pauline reference, that towards the close of the first century *οἱ φίλοι* was not a technical name applied by Christians to one another. Had all Christians borne this name, John would not have been able to apply it to his inner circle.[1] This result comes as a surprise, for not only were Christians to be "friends" to each other, but even about the year 100 A.D. two gospels were being read, in which Jesus himself called his disciples *οἱ φίλοι μου* (my friends).[2] In Luke xii. 4 he declares, *λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων τὸ σῶμα*; while John xv. 13-15 contains the great saying: *μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς*

[1] In the gospel of Peter (v. 26), Peter speaks of his fellow-disciples as his *ἑταῖροι* or comrades. But even this is not a technical title. Julius Africanus ends his letter to Origen with the words, *τοὺς κυρίους μου προσαγόρευε· σὲ οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι πάντες προσαγορεύουσιν* ("Salute my masters; all who understand salute thee"). We do not know who are designated by *οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι*, or how the term is to be taken, but in any case it denotes an inner circle.

[2] The words quoted by Clement (*quis dives salv.* xxxiii.), *δώσω οὐ μόνον τοῖς φίλοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς φίλοις τῶν φίλων* ("I will give not merely to the friends, but to their friends"), probably represent an apocryphal saying of Jesus; cp. Jülicher in *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1894, No. 1. But its origin is uncertain.

ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ· ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε, ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν· οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. These sayings of our Lord could not, however, induce the early Christians to use the title of "friends" as a *mutual* designation, for something far more glorious was conveyed by them, viz., the assurance that the Master looked upon them as his friends, because he had made known to them whatever he himself had heard from the Father. As *his* friends they were therefore "friends of God," raised to the same height of privilege as Abraham, who alone bore the honorary title of "God's friend" in Jewish tradition.[1] Thus in Eph. ii. 19, Paul brings the conception of φίλοι to a climax by writing, "ye are no longer strangers and sojourners, but fellow-citizens of the saints and *of the household of God*" (οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλ' ἐστὲ συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ), while Valentinus (in Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, VI. 6. 52) speaks of "the people befriended by the Beloved and friendly to him" (λαὸς ὁ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου ὁ φιλούμενος καὶ φιλῶν αὐτόν).

While, however, we can readily understand how these words of Jesus did not prevail upon Christians to adopt the title of "friends" (sc., "of Jesus" or "of God"), which involved something too sublime and

[1] Occasionally the prophets also got this title; cp. Hippol., *Philos.*, x. 33, δίκαιοι ἄνδρες γεγένηνται φίλοι θεοῦ· οὗτοι προφῆται κέκληνται ("Just men have become friends of God, and these are named prophets"). Justin gives the name of Χριστοῦ φίλοι ("Christ's friends") to the prophets who wrote the Old Testament scriptures (*Dial. Tryph.* viii.). For John the Baptist as a φίλος of Jesus, cp. John iii. 29.

too severe for ordinary life,[1] the question still remains, why did they not call each other friends?[2] To this, I think, an answer can be readily found. The early Christians neglected the term "friends" just because they knew and used a term which was still more warm and close, viz. that of "brethren" (see above). The name of "brethren" alone seemed to express what Christians were and were to be. In primitive Christianity "brother" could not leave any room for "friend," so powerful was their consciousness of the spiritual unity in their position, so absorbing was their sense of mutual responsibility. Even Christ had enjoined the love, not of friends, but of brethren; with brotherly love and not with friendship had he bound up the love of God. And even their Master could be thought of as their *brother*. As Paul said, he was "the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29). The name of "brethren," after remaining for about a century and a half the general term applied by Christians to one another, fell into gradual disuse in the course of the third century. Step by step this

[1] The "saints" did use the title (see above), but it did not stand by any means on the same high footing as that of "the friends of God." It is only Clement of Alexandria (who made ample use of the rights conferred by the Christian religion) who writes (in *Prokrept.* xii., 122) *εἰ κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, θεοφιλὴς δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ —καὶ γὰρ οὗν φίλος μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ λόγου—, γίνεται δὴ οὗν τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι τὰ πάντα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κοινὰ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν φίλοιν τὰ πάντα, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου* ("If all that friends have is a common possession, and man be the friend of God—for through the mediator of the world he has become indeed God's friend—then all things become man's, inasmuch as all things are God's and so the common property of both friends, God and man").

[2] The expression "dear to God" (dei cari), as applied to Christians, occurs several times in Cyprian (cp., *e.g.*, *ad Demetr.* xii.).

process of neglect may be followed in the literature of early Christianity during the second and third centuries, and the doom of the title was sealed by the formation of a special class of clerics, who called one another (as they still do) "brethren," and did not address the laity by this title *except* (by a paltry survival of the old tradition) *in their sermons.* By the opening of the third century no layman ventured any longer to call ecclesiastics "brethren."

So perished the name, and more than the name, of "brethren." Nor did the title of "friends" succeed to the vacant position.[1] By this time it was too late for the church at large to adopt such a title, for in the interests of authority and discipline throughout the secularized communities it had been already found necessary to erect barriers between man and man, in order to prevent the whole field being left open to barriers thrown up by property and social position. In any aspect whatsoever, the name of "friends" would have been an anachronism. The feeling of brotherhood and of friendship had not died out of the church. In no age have they ever been entirely absent, and the third century can show brilliant traits in this line. Still, they were

[1] Had Christians as a whole been people of the stamp of Clement of Alexandria, at the close of the second century, Christendom would have grown from a nation of "brethren" into one of "friends." In *quis dives salv.* xxxii. there is a beautiful saying upon friendship: Οὐ μὴ οὐδ' εἶπεν ὁ κύριος (Luke xvi. 9) Δὸς, ἢ Παράσχες, ἢ Εὐεργέτησον, ἢ Βοήθησον· Φίλον δὲ ποίησαι· ὁ δὲ φίλος οὐκ ἐκ μιᾶς δόσεως γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅλης ἀναπαύσεως καὶ συνουσίας μακρας ("The Lord did not say, give, or provide, or benefit, or aid, but make a friend; and friendship springs, not from a single act of giving, but from invariable relief vouchsafed and from long intercourse").

no longer the determining element of Christianity as a whole. Their place had been taken by the cultus.

The Catholic church, however, was not Christianity as a whole, nor was its attitude even the norm for all the members within its communion. Alongside of it, or inside it, there grew up circles, "sects," and conventicles, in which people drew closer to each other and endeavoured to resuscitate primitive Christianity, or what they took to be such. Within these circles the name of "friends" also was revived. So far as this had already taken place within the gnostic sects of the second century, it is impossible to ignore the influence of the philosophic schools. Epiphanes, the son of Carpocrates, for example, founded a Christian communistic guild upon the model of the Pythagoreans, which was probably influenced also by the Epicurean schools and their organization (Clem., *Strom.*, III. 5–9); while Valentinus, one of the profoundest thinkers in the second century, wrote a homily "on friends" (*περί φίλων*, *op. cit.*, VI. 6. 52) of which unfortunately nothing but a small fragment is extant. Yet it was not until a much later period that the name of "friends," as a title applied by definite groups of Christians to themselves, became of any moment from the standpoint of church history. This occurred first of all in the fourteenth century, then again in the seventeenth; nor has the latter movement lost its power even at the present day. In the former case it was the *Gottesfreunde*, who united under this name on the Upper Rhine and in the south of Germany, in order to promote warmth in the inner life and ignite the fires of love to God and to one's neighbour in a

church that had grown cold. One has only to think of Tauler to be reminded of the debt owed by our fatherland to such "friends of God." In the latter case it was George Fox, who founded the society of the Friends or Quakers about 1650—the most thoroughgoing protest, in principles, dogmas, and forms of worship, of any Christian society against the ceremonialism and externalism of the English Established Church. Yet this formed itself a distinct society, with characteristics of its own, and inspired by the warmest love of friends. The thoroughness of the Friends impeded their spread, but although the numbers of their membership have never been considerable, their influence upon the moral and spiritual life of England is not to be undervalued; while at the present day, both in England and in America, "the Friends" are actively engaged in the diffusion of pure piety and in the task of putting a deep and real content into "friendship."

EXCURSUS II.[1]

CHRISTIAN NAMES.

Does the use of Christian names taken from the Bible go back as far as the first three centuries? In answering this question, we come upon several instructive results.

Upon consulting the earliest synodical Acts in our possession, those of the North African synod in 256 A.D. (preserved in Cyprian's works), we find that while the names of the eighty-seven bishops who voted there are for the most part Latin, though a considerable number are Greek, not one Old Testament name occurs. Only two are from the New Testament, viz. Peter (No. 72) and Paul (No. 47). Thus in the middle of the third century pagan names were still employed quite freely throughout Northern Africa, and the necessity of employing Christian names had hardly as yet arisen. The same holds true of all the other regions of Christendom. As inscriptions and writings testify, Christians in East and West alike made an exclusive or almost exclusive use of the old pagan names in their environment till after the middle of the third century, employing,

[1] The following paragraphs were published in the *Christliche Welt* (No. xiv.), and now appear in an enlarged form.

indeed, very often names from pagan mythology and soothsaying. We find Christians called Apollinaris, Apollonius, Heraclius, Saturninus, Mercurius, Bacchylus, Bacchylides, Serapion, Satyrus, Aphrodisius, Dionysius, Hermas, Origen, etc., besides Faustus, Felix, and Felicissimus. "The martyrs perished because they declined to sacrifice to the gods whose names they bore"!

Now this is truly remarkable! Here was the primitive church exterminating every vestige of polytheism in her midst, tabooing pagan mythology as devilish, living with the great personalities of the Bible and upon their words, and yet freely employing the pagan names which had been hitherto in vogue! The problem becomes even harder if one bears in mind that the Bible itself contains examples of fresh names being given,[1] that surnames and alterations of a name were of frequent occurrence in the Roman empire (the practice, in fact, being legalized by the emperor Caracalla in 212 for all free men), and that a man's name in antiquity was by no means regarded by most people as a matter of indifference.

One may be disposed to seek various reasons for this indifference displayed by the primitive Christians towards names. One may point to the fact that a whole series of pagan names must have been rendered sacred from the outset by the mere fact of distinguished Christians having borne them. One may further recollect how soon Christians got the length

[1] Thus in the gospels we read of Jesus calling Simon "Kephas" and the sons of Zebedee "Boanerges." In Acts iv. 36 we are told that the apostles named a man called Joseph "Barnabas" (Saulus Paulus does not come under this class).

of strenuously asserting that there was nothing in a name. Why, from the days of Trajan onwards they were condemned on account of the mere name of "Christian," without anyone thinking it necessary to inquire if they had actually committed any crime! On the other hand, Justin, Athenagoras, and Tertullian, the apologists of Christianity, emphasize the fact that the name is a hollow vessel, that there can be no rational "charge brought against words," —"except, of course," adds Tertullian, "when a name sounds barbarian or ill-omened, or when it contains some insult or impropriety!" "Ill-omened"! But had "dæmonic" names like Saturninus, Serapion, and Apollonius no connotation of ill-luck upon the lips of Christians, and did not Christians, on the other hand, attach a healing virtue to the very language of certain formulas (*e.g.*, the utterance of the name of Jesus), just as the heathen did? No; surely this does not serve to explain the indifference felt by Christians towards mythological titles. But if not, then how are we to explain it?

Hardly any other answer can be given to the question save this, that the general custom of the world in which people were living proved stronger than any reflections of their own. At all times, new names have encountered a powerful resistance in the plea, "There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name" (Luke i. 61). The result was that people retained the old names, just as they had to endorse or to endure much that was of the world, so long as they were in the world. Nor was it worth while to alter the name which one found oneself bearing. Why, everyone, be he called Apollonius or Serapion, had

already got a second, distinctive, and abiding name in baptism, the name of "Christian." Each individual believer bore that as a proper name. In the Acts of Carpus (during the reign of Marcus Aurelius) the magistrate asked the accused, "What is thy name?" The answer was, "My first and foremost name is that of 'Christian'; but if thou demandest my worldly name as well, I am called 'Carpus.'" The "worldly" name was kept up, but it did not count, so to speak, as the real name. In the account of the martyrs at Lyons, Sanctus the Christian is said to have withheld his proper name from the magistrate, contenting himself with the one reply, "I am a Christian!"

This one name satisfied people till about the middle of the third century, and along with it they bore the ordinary names of this world "as though they bore them not." Even surnames with a Christian meaning are extremely rare. It is the exception, not the rule, to find a man like bishop Ignatius calling himself by the additional Christian title of Theophorus at the opening of the second century.[1] The change came first of all a little before the middle of the third century. And the surprising thing is that the change,

[1] Other surnames (which were not Christian) also occur among Christians; cp. Tertull., *ad Scapulam* iv.: "Proculus Christianus, qui Torpacion cognominabatur." Similar cases were not unusual at that time. The Christian soldier Tarachus (*Acta Tarachi* in Ruinart's *Acta Martyr.*, Ratisbon, 1859, p. 452), says: "My parents call me Tarachus, and when I became a soldier I was called Victor" ("a parentibus dicor Tarachus, et cum militarem nominatus sum Victor"). Cyprian (according to Jerome, *de vir. illustr.* xlviii.) called himself Cæcilius after the priest who was the means of his conversion, and besides that he bore the surname of Thascius, so that his full name ran, "Cæcilius Cyprianus qui et Thascius" (*ep.* lxii., an

for which the way had been slowly paved, came, not in an epoch of religious elevation, but rather in the very period during which the church was coming to terms with the world on a larger scale than had hitherto been the case. In the days when Christians bore pagan names and nothing more, the dividing line between Christianity and the world was drawn much more sharply than in the days when they began to call themselves Peter and Paul! As so often is the case, the forms made their appearance just when the spirit was undermined. The principle of "nomen est omen" was not contradicted. It remained extraordinarily significant. For the name indicates that one has to take certain measures in order to keep hold of something that is in danger of disappearing.

In many cases people may not have been conscious of this. On the contrary, three reasons were at work. One of these I have already mentioned, viz., the frequent occurrence throughout the empire (even among pagans) of an alteration in a name, and also of surnames being added, after the edict of Caracalla (in 212 A.D.). The second lay in the practice of infant baptism, which was now gaining full currency. As

epistle, too, which is written to a Christian called "Florentius qui et Puppianus"). Cumont (*Les Inscr. chrét. de l'Asie mineure*, p. 22) has collected a series of examples from the inscriptions, some of which are undoubtedly Christian; Γέρων ὁ καὶ Κυριακός, Ἄτταλος ἐπίκλην Ἡσαΐας, Optatina Resticia Pascasia, M. Cæcilius Saturninus qui et Eusebius, Valentina ancilla quae et Stephana, Ascia vel Maria. Of the forty martyrs of Sebaste two bear double names of this kind, viz., Λεόντιος ὁ καὶ Θεόκτιστος and Βικράτιος ὁ καὶ Βιβιανός. In *The Martyrdom of St Conon* we find a Ναόδωρος ὁ καὶ Ἀπελλῆς. The martyr Achatius says, "I am called Agathos-angelus" ("vocor Agathos-angelus").

a name was conferred upon the child at this solemn act, it naturally seemed good to choose a specifically Christian name. Thirdly and lastly, and—we may add—chiefly, the more the church entered the world, the more the world also entered the church. And with the world there entered more and more of the old pagan superstition that "nomen est omen," the dread felt for words, and, moreover, the old propensity for securing deliverers, angels, and spiritual heroes upon one's side, together with the "pious" belief that one made a saint inclined to be one's protector and patron by taking his name. Such a form of superstition has never been wholly absent from Christianity, for even the primitive Christians were not merely Christians but also Jews, Syrians, Asiatics, Greeks, or Romans. But then it was restrained by other moods or movements of the Spirit. During the third century, however, the local strain again rose to the surface. People no longer called their children Bacchylus or Aphrodisius with the same readiness, it is true. *But they began to call themselves Peter and Paul in the same sense as the pagans called their children Dionysius and Serapion.*

The process of displacing mythological by Christian names was carried out very slowly. Nor was it ever quite completed, for not a few of the former gradually became Christian, thanks to some glorious characters who had borne them, and thus entirely lost their original meaning. One or two items from the history of this process may be adduced at this point in our discussion.

At the very time when we find only two Biblical names (those of Peter and Paul) in a list of eighty-

seven episcopal names, bishop Dionysius of Alexandria writes that Christians prefer to call their children Peter and Paul.[1] It was then also that Christian changes[2] of name began to be common. It is noted (in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 30) that Gregory Thaumaturgus exchanged the name of Theodore for Gregory, but this instance is not quite clear.[3] We are told that a certain Sabina, during the reign of Decius (in 250 A.D.) called herself Theodota when she was asked at her trial what was her name.[4] In the Acta of a certain martyr called Balsamus (311 A.D.), the accused cries: "According to my paternal name I am Balsamus, but according to the spiritual name which I received at baptism, I am Peter."[5] Interesting, too, is the account given by Eusebius (*Mart. Pal.*, xi.

[1] In Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 25. 14: ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τοῖς τῶν πιστῶν παισὶν ὀνομάζεται ("Even as the children of the faithful are often called after Paul and also after Peter"). This is corroborated by an inscription from the third century (de Rossi, in *Bullett. di archæol. crist.* 1867, p. 6): DM M . ANNEO . PAVLO . PETRO . M . ANNEVS . PAVLVS: FILIO . CARISSIMO. The inscription is also interesting on account of the fact that Seneca came from this *gens*.

[2] It has been asserted that Pomponia Græcina retained or assumed the name of Lucina as a Christian (de Rossi, *Roma Sotterr.*, I. p. 319, II. pp. 362, etc.), but this is extremely doubtful.—Changes of name were common among the Jews as well as in the Diaspora (see *CIG.*, vol. iv. No. 9905: "Beturia Paula—que bixit ann. LXXXVI. meses VI. proselyta ann. XVI. nomine Sara mater synagogarum Campi et Bolumni").

[3] Did he call himself Gregory as an "awakened" man?

[4] Cp. *Acta Pionii* ix.; this instance, however, is hardly relevant to our purpose, as Pionius instructed Sabina to call herself Theodota, in order to prevent herself from being identified.

[5] Three martyrs at Lampsacus are called Peter, Paul, and Andrew (cp. Ruinart's *Acta Martyr.*, 1859, pp. 205 f.).

7 f.) of five Egyptian Christians who were martyred during the Diocletian persecution. They all bore Egyptian names. But when the first of them was questioned by the magistrate, he replied not with his own name but with that of an Old Testament prophet. Whereupon Eusebius observes, "This was because they had assumed such names in place of the names given them by their parents, names probably derived from idols; so that one could hear them calling themselves Elijah,[1] Jeremiah, Isaiah, Samuel, and Daniel, thus giving themselves out to be Jews in the spiritual sense, even the true and genuine Israel of God, not merely by their deeds, but by the names they bore."

Obviously, the ruling idea here is not yet that of patron saints; the prophets are selected as models, not as patrons. Even the change of name itself is still a novelty. This is borne out by the festal epistles of Athanasius in the fourth century, which contain an extraordinary number of Christian names, almost all of which are the familiar pagan names (Greek or Egyptian). Biblical names are still infrequent. In one passage, however, writing of a certain Gelous Hierakammon, Athanasius does remark that "out of shame he took the name of Eulogius in addition to his own name."[2]

It is very remarkable that down to the middle of the fourth century Peter and Paul are about the only New Testament names to be met with, while Old Testament names again are so rare that the above case of the five Egyptians who had assumed prophetic

[1] See *Mart. Pal.*, x. 1, for a martyr of this name.

[2] *Festal Epistles*, ed. by Larsow (p. 80).

names must be treated as an exception to the rule. Even the name of John, so far as I know, only began to appear within the fourth century, and that slowly. On the other hand, we must not here adduce a passage from Dionysius of Alexandria, which has been already under review. He certainly writes: "In my opinion, many persons [in the apostolic age] had the same name as John, for out of love for him, admiring and emulating him, and desirous of being loved by the Lord even as he was, many assumed the same surname, just as many of the children of the faithful are also called Peter and Paul." But what Dionysius says here about the name of John is simply a conjecture with regard to the apostolic age, while indirectly, but plainly enough, he testifies that Christians in his own day were called Peter and Paul, but not John. This preference assigned to the name of the two apostolic leaders throughout the East and West alike is full of instruction, and it is endorsed by a passage from Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch, who was a contemporary of Athanasius. "Many Jews," he writes, "call themselves after the patriarchs and prophets, and yet are guilty of wickedness. Many [Christian] Greeks call themselves Peter and Paul, and yet behave in a most disgraceful fashion." Evidently these people still left the Old Testament names as a rule to the Jews, while Peter and Paul continue apparently to be the only New Testament names which are actually in use. This state of matters lasted till the second half of the fourth century. As the saints, prophets, patriarchs, angels, etc., henceforth took the place of the dethroned gods of paganism, and as the stories of these gods were transformed into stories of

the saints, the supersession of mythological names now commenced in real earnest.[1] Now for the first time do we often light upon names like John, James, Andrew, Simon, and Mary, besides—though much more rarely in the West—names from the Old Testament. At the close of the fourth century, Chrysostom, *e.g.*, exhorts the believers to call their children after the saints, so that the saints may serve them as examples of virtue. But in giving this counsel he does not mention its most powerful motive, a motive disclosed by Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus in Syria, thirty years afterwards. It is this: that people are to give their children the names of saints and martyrs, in order to win them the protection and patronage of these heroes.[2] Then and thereafter this was the object which dominated the choice of names. The result was a selection of names, varying with the different countries and provinces; for the calendar of the provincial saints and the names of famous local bishops who were dead, were taken into account alongside of the Bible. As early as the close of the fourth century, *e.g.*, people in Antioch liked to call their children after the great bishop Meletius. Withal, haphazard and freedom of choice always played some part in the choice of a name, nor was it

[1] The thirtieth of the Arabic canons of Nicæa is unauthentic and late: "Fideles nomina gentilium filiis suis non imponant; sed potius omnis natio Christianorum suis nominibus utatur, ut gentiles suis utuntur, imponanturque nomina Christianorum secundum scripturam in baptismo" ("Let not the faithful give pagan names to their children. Rather let the whole Christian people use its own names, as pagans use theirs, giving children at baptism the names of Christians according to the Scripture").

[2] *Graec. affect. curat.*, viii. p. 923, ed. Schultze.

every ear that could grow accustomed to the sound of barbarian Semitic names. As has been observed already, the Western church was very backward in adopting Old Testament names, and this continued till the advent of Calvinism.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, AS BEARING UPON THE CHRISTIAN MISSION. THE EPISCOPATE.[1]

CHRISTIAN preaching aimed at winning souls and bringing individuals to God, "that the number of the elect might be made up," but from the very outset it worked along the lines of a community and proposed to itself the aim of uniting all together who believed in Christ. Primarily this union was one which consisted of the disciples of Jesus. But, as we have already seen, these disciples were conscious of being *the true Israel* and *the ecclesia of God.* Such they held themselves to be. Hence they appropriated to themselves the form and well-knit frame of Judaism, spiritualizing it and strengthening it, so that by one stroke (we may say) they secured a firm and exclusive organization.

But while this organization, embracing all Christians on earth, rested in the first instance solely upon religious ideas, as a purely ideal conception it would hardly have remained effective for any length of

[1] Cp. on this Von Dobschütz's *die urchristlichen Gemeinden* (1902) [translated in this library under the title of *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*].

time, had it not been allied to *local organization*; and Christianity, at the initiative of the original apostles and the brethren of Jesus, began by borrowing this as well from Judaism, *i.e.* from the synagogue. Throughout the Diaspora the Christian communities developed at first out of the synagogues with their proselytes or adherents. *Designed to be essentially a brotherhood, and springing out of the synagogue, the Christian society developed a local organization which was of double strength*, superior to anything achieved by the societies of Judaism.[1] One extremely advantageous feature of these local organizations in their significance for Christianity falls to be added. It was this: every community was at once a unit, complete in itself; but it was also a reproduction of the collective church of God, and it had to recognize and manifest itself as such.[2]

Such a religious and social organization, destitute of any political or national basis, was a novel and unheard-of thing upon the soil of Greek and Roman

[1] We cannot discuss the influence which the Greek and Roman guilds may have exercised upon Christianity. In any case it can have borne merely on certain *forms*, not on the essential fact itself or on its fixed nature.

[2] We do not know how this remarkable conviction arose, but it lies perfectly plain upon the surface of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages. It did not originate in Judaism, since—to my knowledge—the individual Jewish synagogue did not look upon itself in this light. Nor did the conception spring up at a single stroke. Even in Paul two contradictory conceptions still lie unexplained together; for while on the one hand he regards each community, so to speak, as a "church of God," sovereign, independent, and responsible for itself, on the other hand his churches are at the same time his own creations, which consequently remain under his control and training, and are in fact even threatened by him with the rod. He is their father and their schoolmaster.

life, where religious and social organizations only existed as a rule in quite a rudimentary form. All that people could think of in this connection was one or two schools of philosophy, whose common life was also a religious life. But here was a society which united fellow-believers, who were resident in any city, in the closest of ties, presupposing a relationship which was assumed as a matter of course to last through life itself, furnishing its members not only with a holy unction administered once and for all or from time to time, but with a daily bond which provided them with spiritual benefits and imposed duties on them, assembling them at first daily and then weekly, shutting them off from other people, uniting them in a guild of worship, a friendly society, and an order with a definite line of life in view, besides teaching them to consider themselves the community of God.

Neophytes, of course, had to get accustomed or trained at first to a society of this kind, which ran counter to all the requirements made by any other cultus or holy rite upon its devotees, however much the existing guild-life may have paved the way for it

Here the apostolic authority, and, what is more, the general and special authority, of the apostle as the founder of a church, invade and delimit the authority of the individual community, since the latter has to respect and follow the rules laid down and enforced by the apostle throughout all his churches. This he had the right to expect. But, as we see from the epistles to the Corinthians, and especially from the second, conflicts were inevitable. Then again in 3 John we have an important source of information, for here the head of a local church is openly rebelling and asserting his independence against the control of an apostle who attempts to rule the church by means of messengers. When Ignatius reached Asia not long afterwards, the idea of the sovereignty of the individual church had triumphed.

along several lines. That its object should be the *common edification of the members*, that the community was therefore to be like a single body with many members, that every member was to be subordinate to the whole body, that one member was to suffer and rejoice with another, that Jesus Christ did not call individuals apart but built them up into a society in which the individual got his place—all these were lessons which had to be learnt. Paul's epistles prove how vigorously and unweariedly he taught them, and it is perhaps the weightiest feature both in Christianity and in the work of Paul that, so far from being overpowered, the impulse towards association was most powerfully intensified by the individualism which here attained its zenith. For to what higher form can individualism rise than that reached by means of the all-embracing counsel, "Save thy soul"? Brotherly love constituted the lever, and also the entrance into that most wealthy inheritance, the inheritance of the firmly organized church of Judaism. In addition to this there was also the wonderful and practical idea, to which allusion has already been made, of setting the collective church (as an ideal fellowship) and the individual community in such a relationship that whatever was true of the one could be predicated also of the other, the church of Corinth or of Ephesus, *e.g.*, being *the* church of God. Quite apart from the content of these social formations, no statesman and politician can withhold the highest tribute of admiration from the solution which was thus devised for one of the most serious problems of any large organization, viz., how to maintain intact the complete autonomy of the local

communities and at the same time to bind them up in a general nexus, possessed of strength and unity, which should embrace all the empire and gradually develop also into a collective organization.

What a sense of stability a creation of this kind must have conferred upon the individual! What powers of attraction it must have exercised, as soon as its objects came to be understood! It was this, and not any evangelist, which proved to be the most effective missionary. In fact, we may take it as an assured fact that the mere existence and persistent activity of the individual Christian communities did more than anything else to bring about the extension of the Christian religion.[1]

Hence also the injunction, repeated over and again, "let us not forsake the assembling of ourselves to-

[1] We possess no detailed account of the origin of any Christian community, for the narrative of Acts is extremely summary, and the epistles of Paul presuppose the existence of the various churches. Acts indeed is not interested in the local churches. It is only converted brethren that come within its ken, its pages reflecting but the onward rush of the Christian mission, till that mission is merged in the legal proceedings against Paul. The apocryphal Acts are of hardly any use. But from 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and Acts, we can infer one or two traits. Thus while Paul invariably attaches himself to Jews, where such were to be found, and preaches in the synagogues, the result actually is that the small communities which thus arose are drawn mainly from "God-fearing" pagans, and upon the whole from pagans in general, not from Jews. Those who were first converted naturally stand in an important relation to the organization of the churches (Clem. Rom. xlii.: οἱ ἀπόστολοι κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες . . . . καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν = Preaching throughout the country districts and cities, the apostles . . . . appointed those who were their firstfruits, after proving them by the Spirit, to be

gether," — "as some do," adds the epistle to the Hebrews (x. 25). At first and indeed always there were naturally some people who imagined that one could secure the holy contents and blessings of Christianity as one did those of Isis or the Magna Mater, and then withdraw. Or, in cases where people were not so shortsighted, levity, laziness, or weariness were often enough to detach a person from the society. A vainglorious sense of superiority and of being able to dispense with the spiritual aid of the society, was also the means of inducing many to withdraw from fellowship and from the common worship. Many, too, were actuated by fear of the authorities; they avoided attendance at public worship, to prevent themselves being recognized as Christians.[1]

bishops and deacons for those who were to believe); as we learn from 1 Thess. v. 12 f. and Phil. i. 1, a sort of local superintendence at once arose in certain of the communities. But what holds true of the Macedonian churches is by no means true of all the churches, at least during the initial period, for it is obvious that in Galatia and at Corinth no organization whatsoever was in existence for a decade, or even longer. The brethren submitted to a control of "the Spirit." In Acts xiv. 23 (χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς κατ' ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους) the allusion may be accurate as regards one or two communities (cp. also Clem. Rom. xliv.), but it is an extremely questionable statement if it is held to imply that the apostles regularly appointed officials in every locality, and that these were in all cases "presbyters." Acts only mentions church-officers at Jerusalem (xv. 4) and Ephesus (xx. 28, presbyters who are invested with episcopal powers).

[1] Cp. Tertullian, *de fuga* iii.: "Timide conveniunt in ecclesiam: dicitis enim, quoniam incondite convenimus et simul convenimus et complures concurrimus in ecclesiam, quaerimur a nationibus et timemus, ne turbentur nationes" ("They gather to church with trembling. For, you say, since we assemble in disorder, simultaneously, and in great numbers, the heathen make enquiries, and we are afraid of stirring them up against us").

"Seek what is of common profit to all," says Clement of Rome (c. xlviii.). "Keep not apart by yourselves in secret," says Barnabas (iv. 10), "as if you were already justified, but meet together and confer upon the common weal." Similar passages are often to be met with.[1] The worship on Sunday is of course obligatory, but even at other times the brethren are expected to meet as often as possible. "Thou shalt seek out every day the company of the saints, to be refreshed by their words" (*Did.*, iv. 2). "We are constantly in company with one another," says Justin in his description of the Sunday worship (*Apol.*, I. lxvii.), in order to show that this is not the only place of fellowship. Ignatius,[2] too, advocates over and over again more frequent meetings of the church; in fact, his letters are written, in the first instance, for the purpose of binding the individual member as closely as possible to the community and thus securing him against error, temptation, and apostasy. The means to this end is the increased significance attaching to the church. In the church alone all blessings are to be had, in its ordinances and organizations. It is only the church firmly

[1] Herm., *Simil.*, IX. xx.: οὗτοι οἱ ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ ποικίλαις πραγματείαις ἐμπεφυρμένοι οὐ κολλῶνται τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀποπλανῶνται ("These, being involved in many different kinds of occupations, do not cleave to the servants of God, but go astray"); IX. xxvi.: γενόμενοι ἐρημώδεις, μὴ κολλώμενοι τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μονάζοντες ἀπολλύουσι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς ("Having become barren, they cleave not to the servants of God, but keep apart and so lose their own souls").

[2] Cp. Ephes. xiii.: σπουδάζετε πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ ("endeavour to meet more frequently for the praise of God"); *Polyc.* iv.: πυκνότερον συναγωγαὶ γινέσθωσαν ("let meetings be held more frequently"); cp. also *Magn.* iv.

equipped with bishop, presbyters, and deacons, with common worship and with sacraments, which is the creation of God.[1] Consequently beyond its pale nothing is to be found save error and sin; all clandestine meetings for worship are also to be eschewed, and no teacher who arises from outside is to get a hearing, unless he is certificated by the church. The absolute subordination of Christians to the local community has never been more peremptorily demanded, the position of the local community itself has never been more eloquently laid down, than in these primitive documents. Their eager admonitions reveal the seriousness of the peril which threatened the individual Christian, who should even in the faintest degree emancipate himself from the community; thereby he would fall a prey to the "errorists," or glide over into paganism. At this point even the heroes of the church were threat-

[1] The common worship, with its centre in the celebration of the Supper, is the cardinal point. No other cultus could point to such a ceremony, with its sublimity and unction, its brotherly feeling and many-sidedness. Here every experience, every spiritual need, found nourishment. The collocation of prayer, praise, preaching, and the reading of the Word, was modelled upon the worship of the synagogue, and must already have made a deep impression upon pagans; but with the addition of the feast of the Lord's supper, an observance was introduced which, for all its simplicity, could be and actually was regarded from the most diverse standpoints. It was a mysterious, divine gift of knowledge and of life; it was a thanksgiving, a sacrifice, a representation here and now of the death of Christ, a love-feast of the brotherhood, a support of the hungry and distressed. No single observance could well be more than that, and it preserved this character for long, even after it had passed wholly into the region of the mysterious. The members of the church took home portions of the consecrated bread, and consumed them during the week.

ened by a peril, which is singled out also for notice. As men who had a special connection with Christ, and who were quite aware of this connection, they could not well be subject to orders from the churches; but it was recognized even at this early period that if they became "inflated" with pride and held aloof from the fellowship of the church, they might easily come to grief. Thus when the haughty martyrs of Carthage and Rome, both during and after the Decian persecution, came to set up cross-currents in the churches and to uplift themselves against the officials, the great bishops finally resolved to humble them under the laws common to the whole church.

While the individual Christian had a position of his own within the organization of the church, he thereby lost, however, a part of his autonomy along with his fellows. The so-called Montanist contro-

I have already (vol. i. pp. 190 f.) discussed the question how far the communities in their worship were also unions for charitable support, and how influential must have been their efforts in this direction.—A whole series of testimonies, from Pliny to Arnobius (iv. 36) proves that the preaching to which people listened every Sunday, was directed in the first place towards the inculcation of morality: "In conventiculis summus oratur deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur magistratibus exercitibus regibus familiaribus inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus et resolutis corporum vinctione, in quibus aliud auditur nihil nisi quod humanos faciat, nisi quod mites, verecundos, pudicos, castos, familiaris communicatores rei et cum omnibus vobis solidae germanitatis necessitudine copulatos" ("At our meetings prayers are offered to Almighty God, peace and pardon are asked for all in authority, for soldiers, kings, friends, enemies, those still in life, and those freed from the bondage of the flesh; at these gatherings nothing is said except what makes people humane, gentle, modest, virtuous, chaste, generous in dealing with their substance, and closely knit to all of you within he bonds of brotherhood").

versy was in the last resort not merely a struggle to secure a stricter habit of life as against a laxer, but also the struggle of a more independent religious attitude and activity as against one which was prescribed and uniform. The outstanding personalities, the individuality of certain people, had to suffer in order that the majority might not become unmanageable or apostates. Such has ever been, such must ever be, the case in human history. It was only after the Montanist conflict that the church, as individual and collective, attained the climax of its development; henceforth it became an object of desire, coveted by everyone who was on the look-out for power, inasmuch as it had extraordinary forces at its disposal. It now bound the individual closely to itself; it held him, bridled him, and dominated his religious life in all directions. Yet it was not long before the monastic movement originated, a movement which, while it recognized the church in theory (doubt upon this point being no longer possible), set it aside in actual practice.

The progress of the development of the juridical organization from the firmly organized local church[1] to the provincial church,[2] from that again to the larger league of churches, a league which realized itself in synods covering many provinces, and finally

[1] Christians described themselves at the outset as παροικοῦντες ("sojourners"; cp. p. 13); the church was technically "the church sojourning in the city" (ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ παροικοῦσα τὴν πόλιν), but it rapidly became a very definite creation, nor did it by any means stand out as a structure destined to crumble away.

[2] How far this ascent, when viewed from other premisses which are equally real, corresponded to a descent, may be seen from the Excursus to this chapter.

from that league to the collective church, which of course was never quite realized as an organization, though it was always present in idea—this development also contributed to the strengthening of the Christian self-consciousness and missionary activity.[1] It was indeed a matter of moment to be able to proclaim that this church not only embraced humanity in its religious conceptions, but also presented itself to the eye as a great single league stretching from one side of the empire to another, and, in fact, passing out beyond even these imperial boundaries. This church arose through the co-operation of the Christian ideal with the empire, and thus every great force which operated in this sphere had also its part to play in the building up of the church, viz., the universal Christian idea of a bond of humanity (which, at root, denoted, of course, nothing but a bond of the scattered elect throughout mankind), the Jewish church, and the Roman empire. The last named, as has been rightly pointed out, became bankrupt on the basis of the church;[2] and the same might be said of the Jewish church, whose powers of attraction ceased for a large circle of people, so soon as the Christian church had developed, the latter taking them over into its own life. Whether the Christian communities

[1] Tert., *de praescript.* xx.: "Sic omnes [sc. ecclesiae] primae et omnes apostolicae, dum una omnes, probant unitatem communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalis, quae iura non alia natio regit quam eiusdem sacramenti una traditio" ("Thus all are primitive and all apostolic, since they are all alike certified by their union in the communion of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the interchange of hospitable friendship—rights whose only rule is the one tradition of the same mystery in all").

[2] It revived, however, in the Western church.

were as free creations as they were in the first century, or productive of external ordinances as definite and of a union as comprehensive as was the case in the third century — in either case these communities operated with magnetic force on thousands, and they proved of extraordinary service to the Christian mission.

Within the church-organization the most weighty and significant creation was that of the monarchical episcopate.[1] It was the bishops, properly speaking, who held together the individual members of the churches; their rise marked the close of the period during which charismata and offices were in a state of mutual flux, the individual relying only upon God, himself, and spiritually endowed brethren. After the close of the second century bishops were the teachers, high priests, and judges of the church; on their demeanour the churches depended almost entirely for weal or woe. As the office grew to maturity, it seemed like an original creation; but this was simply because it drew to itself from all quarters both the powers and the forms of life.

The extent to which the episcopate, along with the other clerical offices which it controlled, formed the backbone of the church,[2] is shown by the fierce

[1] I leave out of account here all the preparatory steps. It was with the monarchical episcopate that this office first became a power in Christendom, and it does not fall within the scope of the present sketch to investigate the preliminary stages—a task of some difficulty, owing to the fragmentary nature of the sources and the varieties of the original organization throughout the different churches.

[2] Naturally it came more and more to mean the position which was well-pleasing to God and specially dear to him; this is implied already in the term "priest," which became current after the close

war waged against it by the State during the third century (Maximinus Thrax, Decius, Valerian, Diocletian, Daza, Licinius), as well as from many isolated facts. In the reign of Marcus Aurelius, Dionysius of Corinth writes to the church of Athens (Eus., *H.E.*, iv. xxiii.) that while it had well-nigh fallen from the faith, after the death of its martyred bishop Publius, its new bishop Quadratus had reorganized it and filled it with fresh zeal for the faith. Cyprian (*ep.* lv. 11) tells how in the persecution bishop Trophimus had lapsed along with a large section of the church, and had offered sacrifice; but on his return and penitence, the rest followed him, "qui omnes regressuri ad ecclesiam non essent, nisi cum Trofimo comitante venissent" ("none of whom would have returned to the church, had they not had the companionship of Trophimus"). When Cyprian lingered in retreat during the persecution of Decius, the whole community threatened to lapse. So that one sees clearly the significance of the bishop for the church; with him it fell, with him it stood,[1] and

of the second century. Along with the higher class of heroic figures (ascetics, virgins, confessors), the church also possessed a second upper class of clerics, as was well known to pagans in the third century. Thus the pagan in Macarius Magnes (III. xvii.) writes, *a propos* of Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21 ("have faith as a grain of mustard-seed"): "He who has not so much faith as this is certainly unworthy of being reckoned among the brotherhood of the faithful; so that the majority of Christians, it follows, are not to be counted among the faithful, and in fact even among the bishops and presbyters there is not one who deserves this name."

[1] This is the language also of the heathen judge to bishop Achatius: "a shield and succourer of the region of Antioch" ("scutum quoddam ac refugium Antiochiae regionis"; Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, Ratisb., 1859, p. 201): "Veniet tecum [*i.e.* if you return to the old gods] omnis

at all times a vacancy or interregnum constitutes a serious crisis for any church. Without being properly a missionary, the bishop exercised a missionary function. In especial, he preserved individuals from relapsing into paganism, while any bishop who really filled his post was the means of winning over many fresh adherents, as we know, *e.g.*, from the case of Cyprian or of Gregory Thaumaturgus. The episcopal dignity was at once heightened and counterbalanced by the institution of the synods which arose in Greece and Asia (modelled possibly upon the federal diets), and eventually were adopted by a large number of provinces after the opening of the third century. On the one hand, this association of the bishops entirely took away the rights of the laity, who found before very long that it was no use now to leave their native church in order to settle down in another. Yet a synod, on the other hand,

populus, ex tuo pendet arbitrio" ("All the people will accompany you, for they hang on your decision"). The bishop answers of course: "Illi omnes non meo nutu, sed dei praecepto reguntur; audiant me itaque, si iusta persuadeam, sin vero perversa et nocitura, contemnant" ("They are ruled, not by my beck and call, but all of them by God's counsel; wherefore let them hearken to me, if I persuade them to what is right; but despise me, if I counsel what is perverse and mischievous").—Hermas (*Sim.*, IX. xxxi.) says of the shepherds, "sin aliqua e pecoribus dissipata invenerit dominus, vae erit pastoribus. quod si ipsi pastores dissipati reperti fuerint, quid respondebunt pro pecoribus his? numquid dicunt, a pecore se vexatos? non credetur illis. incredibilis enim res est, pastorem pati posse a pecore" ("But if the master finds any of the sheep scattered, woe to the shepherds. For if the shepherds themselves be found scattered, how will they answer for these sheep? Will they say that they were themselves worried by the flock? Then they will not be believed, for it is absurd that a shepherd should be injured by his sheep").

imposed restraints upon the arbitrary actions of a bishop, setting itself forth as an ecclesiastical "forum publicum" to which he was responsible. The correspondence of Cyprian presents several examples of individual bishops being thus brought up by synods for arbitrary conduct and transgressions. Before very long too (may be, from the very outset) the synod, this "representatio totius nominis Christiani," appeared in the light of a specially trustworthy organ of the holy Spirit. The synods which expanded in the course of the third century from provincial synods to larger councils, and which would seem to have anticipated Diocletian's redistribution of the empire in the East, naturally gave an extraordinary impetus to the prestige and authority of the church, and thereby heightened its powers of attraction. Yet the entire synodal system really flourished in the East alone (and to some extent in Africa). In the West it no more burst into blossom than did the system of metropolitans, a fact which was of vital moment to the position of Rome and of the Roman bishop.[1]

One other problem has finally to be considered at this point, a problem which is of great importance for the statistics of the church. It is this: how strong

[1] I do not enter here into the development of the constitution in detail, although by its close relation to the divisions of the empire it bears at many vital points upon the history of the Christian mission (see Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchlich Hierarchie des Orients bis zum ausgang des 4. Jahrhunderts*, 1901). Be it noted only that the ever-increasing dependence of the Eastern church upon the redistributed empire (a redistribution which conformed to national boundaries) imperilled by degrees the unity of the church and the universalism of Christianity. The church began

was the tendency to create independent forms within the Christian communities, *i.e.* to form complete *episcopal* communities? Does the number of communities which were episcopally organized actually denote the number of the communities in general, or were there, either as a whole or in a large number of provinces, a considerable number of communities which possessed no bishops of their own, but had only presbyters or deacons, and which were dependent upon an outside bishop? The following Excursus[1] is devoted to the answering of this important question. Its aim is to show that the creation of complete episcopal communities was the general rule in most provinces (excluding Egypt) down to the middle of the third century, however small might be the number of Christians in any locality, and however insignificant might be the locality itself.

As important, if not still more important, was the tendency, which operated from the very first, to have all the Christians in a given locality united in a single community. As the Pauline epistles prove, house-churches were tolerated at the outset (we do not know how long), but obviously their position was (originally or very soon afterwards) that of members

by developing harmony and vigour in this sphere of action, but centrifugal influences soon commenced to play upon her, influences which are perceptible as early as the Paschal controversy of 190 A.D. between Rome and Asia, which are vital by the time of the controversy over the baptism of heretics, and which at last appear as disintegrating forces in the fourth and fifth centuries. In the West the Roman bishop knew how to restrain them with admirable effect, evincing both tenacity and clearness of purpose.

[1] Read before the Royal Prussian Academy of Science, on 28th Nov. 1901 (pp. 1186 f.).

belonging to the local community as a whole. This original relationship is, of course, as obscure to us as is the evaporation of such churches. Conflicts there must have been at first, and even attempts to set up a number of independent Christian θίασοι in a city; for the "schisms" at Corinth, combated by Paul, would seem to point in this direction. Nor is it quite certain whether, even after the formation of the monarchical episcopate, there were not cases here and there of two or more episcopal communities existing in a single city. But even if this obtained in certain cases, their number must have been very small; nor can these alter the general stamp of the Christian organization throughout its various branches, *i.e.* the general constitution according to which every locality where Christians were to be found had its own independent community, and only one community. This organization, with its simplicity and naturalness, proved itself extraordinarily strong. No doubt, the community was soon obliged to extend the full force of its anti-pagan exclusiveness against such brethren of its own number as refused submission to the church upon any pretext whatsoever. *The sad passion for heresy-hunting, which obtained among Christians as early as the second century, was not only a result of their fanatical devotion to true doctrine, but quite as much an outcome of their rigid organization and of the exalted predicates of honour which they applied to themselves as "the church of God."* Here the reverse of the medal is to be seen. The community's valuation of itself, its claim to represent the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ("the church of God" or "the Catholic church" in Corinth, Ephesus, etc.) made

it eventually unable to recognize or tolerate any Christianity whatsoever outside its own boundaries.[1]

[1] Celsus had already laid sharp stress on heresy-hunting and the passion with which Christians fought one another: *βλασφημοῦσιν εἰς ἀλλήλους οὗτοι πάνδεινα ῥητὰ καὶ ἄρρητα, καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴξαιεν οὐδὲ καθ' ὁτιοῦν εἰς ὁμόνοιαν πάντη ἀλλήλους ἀποστυγοῦντες* (V. lxiii.: "These people utter all sorts of blasphemy, mentionable and unmentionable, against one another, nor will they give way in the smallest point for the sake of concord, hating each other with a perfect hatred").

EXCURSUS.

ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION AND THE EPISCOPATE, FROM PIUS TO CONSTANTINE.

"In 1 Tim. iii. (where only bishops and deacons are mentioned) the apostle Paul has not forgotten the presbyters, for at first the same officials bore the name of 'presbyter' as well as that of 'bishop.' . . . Those who had the power of ordination and are now called 'bishops' were not appointed to a *single* church but to a whole province, and bore the name of 'apostles.' Thus St Paul set Timothy over all Asia, and Titus over Crete. And plainly he also appointed other individuals to other provinces in the same way, each of whom was to take charge of a whole province, making circuits through all the churches, ordaining clergy for ecclesiastical work wherever it was necessary, solving any difficult questions which had arisen among them, setting them right by means of addresses on doctrine, treating sore sins in a salutary fashion, and in general discharging all the duties of a *superintendent*—all the towns, meanwhile, possessing the presbyters of whom I have spoken, men who ruled their respective churches. Thus in that early age there existed those who are now called bishops, but who were then called

apostles, discharging functions for a whole province which those who are nowadays ordained to the episcopate discharge for a single city and a single district. Such was the organization of the church in those days. But when the faith became widely spread, filling not merely towns, but also country districts with believers,[1] then, as the blessed apostles were now dead, came those who took charge of the whole [province]. They were not equal to their predecessors, however, nor could they certify themselves, as did the earlier leaders, by means of miracles, while in many other respects they showed their inferiority. Deeming it therefore a burden to assume the title of 'apostles,' they distributed the other titles [which had hitherto been synonymous], leaving that of 'presbyters' to the presbyters, and assigning that of 'bishops' to those who possessed the right of ordination, and who were consequently entrusted with leadership over all the church. These formed the majority, owing, in the first instance, to the necessity of the case, but subsequently also, on account of the generous spirit shown by those who arranged the ordinations.[2] For at the outset there were but two, or at most three, bishops usually in a province

[1] Gk.: *μέγισται δὲ οὐ πόλεις μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ χῶραι τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἦσαν*, Lat. version = repletae autem sunt non modo civitates credentium, sed regiones. Read *μεσταί* therefore instead of *μέγισται*.

[2] Gk.: *διὰ μὲν τὴν χρείαν τὸ πρῶτον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας τῶν ποιούντων*. Ambition, it might be conjectured, would be mentioned as the motive at work, but in that case *τῶν ποιούντων* would require to be away. *Φιλοτιμία* therefore must mean "liberal spirit," and this is the interpretation given in the Latin version: "Postea vero et illis adiecti sunt alii liberalitate eorum qui ordinationes faciebant."

—a state of matters which prevailed in most of the Western provinces until quite recently, and which may still be found in several, even at the present day. As time went on, however, bishops were ordained not merely in towns, but also in small districts, where there was really no need of anyone being yet invested with the episcopal office."

So Theodore of Mopsuestia in his commentary upon first Timothy.[1] The assertion that "bishop" and "presbyter" were identical in primitive ages occurs frequently about the year 400, but Theodore's statements in general are, to the best of my knowledge, unique; they represent an attempt to depict the primitive organization of the church, and to explain the most important revolution which had taken place in the history of the church's constitution. Theodore's idea is, in brief, as follows. From the outset, he remarks—*i.e.* in the apostolic age, or by original apostolic institution—there was *a monarchical office* in the churches, *to which pertained the right of ordination.* This office was one *belonging to the provincial churches* (each province possessing a single superintendent), and its title was that of "apostle." Individual communities, again, were governed by bishops (presbyters) and deacons. Once the apostles[2] (*i.e.* the original apostles) had died, however, a revolution took place. The motives assigned to this

[1] See Swete's *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epp. b. Pauli commentarii,* vol. ii. (1882), pp. 121 f.

[2] This is the first point of obscurity in Theodore's narrative. "The blessed apostles" are not all the men whom he has first mentioned as "apostles," but either the apostles in the narrowest sense of the term or else these taken together with men like Timothy and Titus.

by Theodore are twofold: in the first place, the spread of the Christian religion, and in the second place, the weakness felt by the second generation of the apostles themselves. The latter therefore resolved (i) to abjure and thus abolish[1] the name of "apostle," and (ii) to distribute the monarchical power, *i.e.* the right of ordination, among several persons throughout a province. Hence the circumstance of two or three bishops existing in the same province—the term "bishop" being now employed in the sense of monarchical authority. That state of matters was the rule until quite recently in most of the Western provinces, and it still survives in several of them. In the East, however, it has not lasted. Partly owing to the requirements of the case (*i.e.* the increase of Christianity throughout the provinces), partly owing to the "liberality" of the apostles,[2] the number of the bishops has multiplied, so that not only towns, but even villages, have come into possession of bishops, although there was no real need for such appointments.

We must in the first instance credit Theodore with being sensible of the fact that the organization of the primitive churches was originally on the broadest scale, and *only came down by degrees* (to the local

[1] This has to be supplied by the reader (which is the second obscure point); the text has merely *βαρὺ νομίσαντες τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχειν προσηγορίαν*. Theodore says nothing about what became of them after they gave up their name and rights.

[2] This is the third point of obscurity in Theodore's statement. By *φιλοτιμία τῶν ποιούντων* it seems necessary to understand the generosity of the retiring "apostles," and yet the process went on —according to Theodore himself—even after these apostles had long left the scene.

communities). Such was indeed the case. The whole was prior to the part. That is, the organization effected by the apostles was in the first place universal, its scope being the provinces of the church. It is Judæa, Samaria, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, etc., that are present to the minds of the apostles, and figure in their writings. Just as in the missions of the present day, outside sects capture "Brandenburg," "Saxony," and "Bavaria," by getting a firm foothold in Berlin, Dresden, Münich, and a few more important cities; just as they forthwith embrace the whole province in their thoughts and in some of the measures which they take, so was it then. Secondly, Theodore's observation upon the extension of the term "apostle" is in itself quite accurate. But it is just at this point, of course, that our doubts begin. It is inherently improbable that the apostles, *i.e.* the twelve together with Paul, appointed the other "apostles" (in the wider sense of the word) collectively; besides, it is contradicted by positive evidence to the contrary,[1] and Theodore's statement of it may be very simply explained as due to the preconceived opinion that everything must ultimately run back to the apostles' institution. Further, the idea of each province having an apostle-bishop set over it is a conjecture based on no real evidence, while it is contradicted by all that we know of the universal ecclesiastical nature of the apostolic office. Finally, it is at least impossible for us to subject to any proof the statement which would bind

[1] Compare the remarks of Paul and the Didachê upon apostles, prophets, and teachers. The apostles are appointed by God or "the Spirit."

up the right of ordination exclusively with the office of the apostle-bishop. In all these aspects Theodore seems to have introduced into his sketch of the primitive churches' organization features which are simply prevailing conceptions of his own day, and hazardous hypotheses. Moreover, we can still show how slender are the grounds on which his conjectures rest. Unless I am mistaken, he has nothing at his disposal in the shape of materials beyond the traditional idea, drawn from the pastoral epistles, of the position occupied by Timothy and Titus in the church, as well as the ecclesiastical notices and legends of the work of John in Asia.[1] All this he has generalized, evolving therefrom the conception of a general appointment of "apostles" who are equivalent to "provincial bishops."[2] "Apostles" are

[1] It is even probable that he has particularly in mind, along with Tit. i. 5 f. and 1 Tim. iii. 1 f., the well-known passage in Clem. Alex., *quis dives salvetur* (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, III. xxiii.), for his delineation of the tasks pertaining to the apostle-bishop coincides substantially with what is narrated of the work of John in that passage (§ 6: *ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἁρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων* = "Appointing bishops in some quarters, arranging the affairs of whole churches in other quarters, and elsewhere selecting for the ministry some one of those indicated by the Spirit"; cp. also the description of how John dealt with a difficult case).

[2] *Clem. Rom.* xl. f. cannot have been present to his mind, for his remarkable and ingenious idea of the identity of "apostles" and "provincial bishops" would have been shattered by a passage in which it is quite explicitly asserted that the apostles *κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καὶ τοὺς ὑπακούοντας τῇ βουλήσει τοῦ θεοῦ βαπτίζοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν* (see above-p. 50), while xlii. describes a succession, not of apostles one after another, but of bishops.

equivalent to "provincial bishops"; such is Theodore's conception, and the conception is a fantasy. Whether it contains any hidden kernel of historical truth, we shall see later on. Meantime we must, in the first instance, follow up Theodore's statements a little further.

He is right in recognizing that any survey of the origin of the church's organization must be based upon the apostles and their missionary labours. We may add, the organization which arose during and owing to the mission would attempt to maintain itself even after local authorities and institutions had been called into being which asserted rights of their own. But the distinctive trait in Theodore's conception consists in the fact that *he knows absolutely nothing of any originally constituted rights appertaining to local authorities.* He has no eyes for all that the New Testament and the primitive Christian writings, as a whole, contain upon this point; for even here, in his view, everything must have flowed from some apostolic injunction or concession—*i.e.* from above to below. He adduces, no doubt, the "weakness" of the "apostles" in the second generation —which is quite a remarkable statement, based on the cessation of miraculous gifts.[1] But it was in virtue of their own resolve that the apostles withdrew

[1] It seems inevitable that we should take Theodore as holding that the cessation of the miraculous power hitherto wielded by the apostles was a divine indication that they were now to efface themselves.—It was a widely-spread conviction (see Origen in several passages, which Theodore read with care) that the apostolic power of working miracles ceased at some particular moment in their history. The power of working miracles and the apostles' power of working miracles are not, however, identical.

from the scene, distributing their power to other people; for *only there could the local church's authority originate*! Such is his theory; it is extremely ingenious, and dominated all over by the magical conception of the apostolate. The local church-authority (or the monarchical and supreme episcopate) within the individual community owed its origin to the "apostolic" provincial authority, by means of a conveyance of power; and during the lifetime of the apostles it was quite in a dependent position. Even after their departure, the supreme episcopal authority did not forthwith come into being within each complete community. On the contrary, says Theodore, it was only two or three towns in every province, which at the outset possessed a bishop of their own (*i.e.* in the new sense of the term "bishop"). Not until a later date, and even then only by degrees, were other towns and even villages added to these original towns, while in the majority of provinces throughout the West the old state of matters prevailed, says Theodore, till quite recently. In some provinces it prevails at present.[1]

This theory about the origin of the local monarchical episcopate baffles any discussion.[2] We may

[1] Theodore seems to regard this original state of matters as the ideal. At any rate, he expresses displeasure at the village-episcopacy.

[2] All the more so, that Theodore never goes into the question of how the individual community was ruled *at first* (whether by some local council or by a single presbyter-bishop). He says nothing, either, of the way in which the monarchical principle was reached in the individual community. We seem shut up to the conjecture that in his view the individual communities were ruled by councils for several generations.

say without any hesitation that Theodore had no authentic foundation for it whatsoever. Even when he might appear to be setting up at least the semblance of historic trustworthiness for his identification of "apostles" with "provincial bishops," by his reference to Timothy, Titus, and John, the testimony breaks down entirely. We are compelled to ask, Who were these retiring apostles? What sources have we for our knowledge of their resignation? How do we learn of this conveyance of authority which they are declared to have undertaken? These questions, we may say quite plainly, Theodore ought to have felt in duty bound to answer; for in what sources can we read anything of the matter? It was not without reason that Theodore veiled even the exact time at which this great renunciation took effect. We can only suppose that it was conceived to have occurred about the year 100 A.D.[1]

At the same time there is no reason to cast aside the statements of Theodore *in toto*. They start a whole set of questions on which historians have not as yet bestowed a due meed of attention, questions relating to the position of bishops in the local church, territorial or provincial bishops (if such there were), and metropolitans. To put the problem more exactly: Were there territorial (or provincial) bishops in the primitive period? And was the territorial

[1] Theodore adduces one "proof," solely for his assertion that originally there were only two or three bishoprics in every province. He refers to the situation in the West, as this had existed up till recently, and as it still existed in some quarters. But the question here is whether he has correctly understood the circumstances of the case, and whether these circumstances can really be linked on to what is alleged to have taken place about the year 100.

bishop perhaps even older than the bishop of the local church? Furthermore, did the two disparate systems of organization denoted by these titles happen to rise simultaneously, coming to terms with each other only at a later period? Finally, was the metropolitan office, which is not visible till the second half of the second century, originally an older creation? Can it have been merely the sequel of an earlier monarchical office, which obtained in the ecclesiastical provinces? These questions are of vital moment to the history of the extension of Christianity, and in fact to the statistics of primitive Christianity: for, supposing that it was the custom in many provinces to be content with one or two or three bishoprics for several generations, it would be impossible to conclude from the small number of bishoprics in certain provinces that Christianity was only scantily represented in these districts. The investigation of this question is all the more pressing, inasmuch as Duchesne has recently (*Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, i., 1894, pp. 36 f.) gone into it, referring—although with caution—to the statements of Theodore, and deducing far-reaching conclusions with regard to the organization of the churches in Gaul. We shall require in the first instance to make ourselves familiar with his propositions[1] (pp. 1–59). I give the main conclusion in his own words.

P. 32: "Dans les pays situés à quelque distance de

[1] Duchesne, be it observed, only draws these conclusions for Gaul, nor has he yet said his last word upon the other provinces. I have reason to believe that his verdict and my own are not very different; hence in what follows I am attacking, not himself, but conclusions which may be drawn from his statements.

la Mediterranée et de la basse vallée du Rhône, il ne s'est fondé aucune église (Lyon exceptée) avant le milieu du IIIe siècle environ."

Pp. 38 f.: "Il en resulte que, dans l'ancienne Gaule celtique, avec ses grandes subdivisions en Belgique, Lyonnaise, Aquitaine et Germanie, une seule église existait au IIe siècle, celle de Lyon . . . . ce que nos documents nous apprennent, c'est que l'église de Lyon était, en dehors de la Narbonnaise, non la première, mais la seule. *Tous les chrétiens épars depuis le Rhin jusqu' aux Pyrénées*[1] *ne formaient qu'une seule communauté; ils reconnaissaient un chef unique, l'évêque de Lyon.*"

P. 59: "Avant la fin du IIIe siècle—sauf toujours la région du bas Rhône et de la Méditerranée—peu d'évêchés en Gaule et cela seulement dans les villes les plus importantes. A l'origine, au premier siècle chrétien pour votre pays (150–250), une seule église, celle de Lyon, réunissant dans un même cercle d'action et de direction tous les groupes chrétiens épars dans les diverses provinces de la Celtique."

Duchesne reaches this conclusion in virtue of the following observations:—

1. No reliable evidence for a single Gallic bishopric, apart from that of Lyons, goes back beyond the middle of the third century.[2] Nor do the episcopal lists, so far as they fall to be considered at all in this connec-

[1] From the mention of the Pyrenees it is obvious that Duchesne includes Aquitania and the extreme S.W. of France in the province of which Lyons is said to have formed the only bishopric.

[2] Arles alone was certainly in existence before 250 A.D., as the correspondence of Cyprian proves. But Arles lay in the province Narbonensis, which is excluded from the purview now before us.

tion, take us any further back. Verus of Vienna, *e.g.*, who was present at the council of Arles in 314 A.D., is counted as the fourth bishop in these lists; which implies that the bishopric of Vienna could hardly have been founded before ± 250 A.D.

2. The heading of the well-known epistle from Vienna and Lyons (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 1) runs thus: *οἱ ἐν Βιέννῃ καὶ Λουγδούνῳ τῆς Γαλλίας παροικοῦντες δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ* ("the servants of Christ sojourning at Vienna and Lyons"). This heading resembles others, such as *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην*, or *Κόρινθον, Φιλίππους, Σμύρναν*, etc. ("the church of God sojourning at Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Smyrna," etc), and consequently represents both churches as a unity—at least upon that reading of the words which first suggests itself.[1]

3. In this epistle "Sanctus, deacon from Vienna," is mentioned — a phrase which would hardly be intelligible if it alluded to one of the deacons of the bishop of Vienna, but which is perfectly natural if Sanctus was the deacon who managed the inchoate church of Vienna, as a delegate of the Lyons bishop. In that event Vienna had no bishop of its own.

4. Irenæus in his great work speaks of *churches* in Germany and also among the Iberians, the Celts, and the Libyans. Now it is a well-established fact that there were no organized churches, when he wrote, in Germany (*i.e.* in the military province, for free Germany is not in question). When Irenæus speaks

[1] Certainly this argument is advanced with some circumspection (p. 40): Cette formule semble plutôt désigner un groupe ecclésiastique que deux groupes ayant chacun son organization distincte: en tout cas, elle n'offre rien de contraire à l'indistinction des deux églises.

of *churches*, he must therefore mean churches which were not episcopal churches.[1]

5. Theodore testifies that till quite recently there had been only two or three bishops in the majority of the Western provinces, and that this state of matters still lasted in one or two of them. Now, as a large number of bishoprics can be shown to have existed in southern and middle Italy, as well as in Africa, we are thrown back upon the other countries of the West. Strictly speaking, it is true, Theodore's evidence only covers his own period, but it fits in admirably with our first four arguments, and is in itself quite natural, that bishoprics were not more numerous in the earlier than in the later period.

6. Eusebius mentions a letter from "the parishes in Gaul over which Irenæus presided" (*τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει*, ***H.E.***, v. 23). Now although *παροικία* usually means the diocese of a bishop, in which sense Eusebius actually employs it in this very chapter, we must nevertheless attach another meaning to it here. "Le verbe *ἐπισκοπεῖν* ne saurait s'entendre d'une simple présidence comme serait celle d'un métropolitain à la tête de son concile. Cette dernière situation est visée dans le même passage d'Eusèbe ; en parlant de l'évêque Théophile, qui présida celui du Pont, il se sert de l'expression *προὐτέτακτο*." In the present instance, then, *παροικίαι* denote "groupes détachés, dispersés, d'une même grande église"—"plusieurs groupes de chrétiens,

[1] It is in this way, I believe, that Duchesne's train of argument must be read (pp. 40 f.). But its trend is not quite clear to my mind.

épars sur divers points du territoire, un seul centre ecclésiastique, un seul évêque, celui de Lyon."

7. Analogous phenomena (*i.e.* the existence of but one bishop at first and for some time to come) occur also in other large provinces, but the proof of this would lead us too far afield.[1] Duchesne contents himself with adducing a single instance which is especially decisive. The anonymous anti-Montanist who wrote in 192–193 A.D. (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16), relates how on reaching Ancyra in Galatia he found the Pontic church (τὴν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησίαν) crammed and confused with the new prophecy. Now Ancyra does not lie in Pontus, and—"ce n'est pas des nouvelles de l'église du Pont qu'il a eues à Ancyre, *c'est l'église elle-même, l'église du Pont, qu'il y a rencontrée.*" Hence it follows in all likelihood[2] that the church of Pontus had still its "chef-lieu" in Ancyra during the reign of Septimius Severus (*c.* 200 A.D.).[3]

8. The extreme slowness with which bishoprics increased in Gaul is further corroborated by the council of Arles (314 A.D.), at which four provinces

[1] P. 42: "D'autres églises que celle de Lyon ont eu d'abord un cercle de rayonnement très étendu et ne se sont en quelque sorte subdivisées qu'après une indivision d'assez longue durée. Je ne veux pas entrer ici dans l'histoire de l'évangélization de l'empire romain: cela m'entraînerait beaucoup trop loin. Il me serait facile de trouver en Syrie, en Égypte et ailleurs des termes de comparaison assez intéressants. Je les néglige pour me borner à un seul exemple," etc.

[2] Duchesne also refers to the notices about Christians in Pontus, which we find in Gregory Thaumaturgus.

[3] This is the period, therefore, in which Duchesne places the anonymous anti-Montanist. In my opinion, he puts him rather too late.

(la Germaine I., la Séquanaise, les Alpes Grées et Pennines, les Alpes Maritimes) were unrepresented. One may assume from this that as yet they contained no autonomous churches whatsoever.[1]

Before examining these arguments in favour of the hypothesis that episcopal churches were in existence, which had extended over wide regions and a number of cities, and in fact over several provinces together, I should like to add a further series of observations which appear also to tell in favour of it.

(1) Paul writes . . . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ (2 Cor. i. 1).

(2) In the Ignatian epistles (*c.* 115 A.D.) not only is Antioch called ἡ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησία ("the church in Syria," *Rom.* ix., *Magn.* xiv., *Trall.* xiii.) absolutely, but Ignatius even describes himself as "the bishop of Syria" (ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Συρίας, *Rom.* ii.).

(3) Dionysius of Corinth writes a letter "to the church sojourning at Gortyna, with the rest of the churches in Crete, commending Philip *their* bishop" (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ παροικούσῃ Γορτύναν ἅμα ταῖς λοιπαῖς κατὰ

[1] A counter-argument is noticed by Duchesne. In Cypr., *ep.* lxviii., we are told that Faustinus, the bishop of Lyons, wrote to Stephen the pope (*c.* 254 A.D.), not only in his own name but in that of "the rest of my fellow-bishops who hold office in the same province" ("ceteri coepiscopi nostri in eadem provincia constituti"). Duchesne admits that the earliest of the bishoprics (next to that of Lyons) may have been already in existence throughout the provincia Lugdunensis, but he considers that it is more natural to think of bishops on the lower Rhone and on the Mediterranean, *i.e.* in the provincia Narbonensis, which had had bishops for a long while.

Κρήτην, Φίλιππον ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν ἀποδεχόμενος.—Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23. 5).

(4) The same author (*op. cit.*, iv. 23. 6) writes a letter "to the church sojourning in Amastris, together with those in Pontus, in which he alludes to Bacchylides and Elpistus as having incited him to write . . . . and mentions their bishop Palmas by name" (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ παροικούσῃ Ἀμαστριν ἅμα ταῖς κατὰ Πόντον, Βακχυλίδου μὲν καὶ Ἐλπίστου ὡσὰν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ γράψαι προτρεψάντων μεμνημένος . . . . ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Πάλμαν ὑποσημαίνων).

(5) In Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 4. 6, we read that "Timothy is stated indeed to have been the first to obtain the episcopate of the parish in Ephesus, just as Titus did over the churches in Crete" (Τιμοθεός γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι, ὡς καὶ Τίτος τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν).

(6) "In the name of the brethren in Gaul over whom he presided, Irenæus sent dispatches," etc. (ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐκ προσώπου ὧν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστείλας, Eus., *H.E.*, v. 24. 11); cp. vi. 46: Διονύσιος τοῖς κατὰ Ἀρμενίαν ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιστέλλει, ὧν ἐπεσκόπευε Μερουζάνης ("Dionysius dispatched a letter to the brethren in Armenia over whom Merozanes presided").

(7) "Demetrius had just then obtained the episcopate over the parishes in Egypt, in succession to Julian" (τῶν δὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ παροικιῶν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν νεωστὶ τότε μετὰ Ἰουλιανὸν Δημήτριος ὑπειλήφει.—Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 2. 2).

(8) "Xystus . . . . was over the church of Rome, Demetrianus . . . . over that of Antioch, Firmilianus over Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and besides these Gregory

and his brother Athenodorus over *the churches in Pontus*" (τῆς μὲν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας . . . . Ξύστος, τῆς δὲ ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας . . . . Δημητριανός, Φιρμιλιανὸς δέ Καισαρείας τῆς Καππαδοκῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησιῶν Γρηγόριος καὶ ὁ τούτου ἀδελφὸς Ἀθηνόδωρος.—Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 14).

(9) "Firmilianus was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Gregory and his brother Athenodorus were pastors of *the parishes in Pontus*, and besides these Helenus of the parish in Tarsus, with Nicomas of Iconium," etc. (Φιρμιλιανὸς μὲν τῆς Καππαδοκῶν Καισαρείας ἐπίσκοπος ἦν, Γρηγόριος δὲ καὶ Ἀθηνόδωρος ἀδελφοὶ τῶν κατὰ Πόντον παροικιῶν ποιμένες, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις Ἕλενος τῆς ἐν Τάρσῳ παροικίας, καὶ Νικομᾶς τῆς ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, etc.—Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 28).

(10) "Meletius, bishop of the churches in Pontus" (Μελέτιος τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος.—Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 32. 26).

(11) "Basilides, bishop of the parishes in Pentapolis" (Βασιλείδης ὁ κατὰ τὴν Πενεάπολιν παροικιῶν ἐπίσκοπος.—Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 26. 3).

(12) Signatures to council of Nicæa (ed. Gelzer et socii): "Calabria—Marcus of Calabria; Dardania—Dacus of Macedonia; Thessaly — Claudianus of Thessaly and Cleonicus of Thebes; Pannonia—Domnus of Pannonia; Gothia — Theophilus of Gothia; Bosporus—Cadmus of Bosporus (Καλαβρίας· Μάρκος Κ.—Δαρδανίας· Δάκος Μακεδονίας.—Θεσσαλίας· Κλαυδιανὸς Θ., Κλεόνικος Θηβῶν.—Παννονίας· Δόμνος Π.—Γοτθίας· Θεόφιλος Γ.—Βοσπόρου· Κάδμος Β.).

(13) *Apost. Constit.*, vii. 46: Κρήσκης τῶν κατὰ Γαλατίαν ἐκκλησιῶν, Ἀκύλας δέ καὶ Νικήτης τῶν κατὰ Ἀσίαν παροικιῶν ("Crescens over the churches in

Galatia, Aquila and Nicetes over the parishes in Asia").[1]

(14) Sozomen (vii. 19) declares that the Scythians had only a single bishop, although their country contained many towns (cp. also Theodoret, *H.E.*, iv. 31, where Bretanio is called the high priest of all the towns in Scythia).

On 1. I note that Duchesne's first argument is an argument from silence. Besides, it must be added that we have no writings in which any direct notice of the early Gothic bishoprics could be expected, so that the argument from silence hardly seems worthy of being taken into account in this connection. The one absolutely reliable piece of evidence (Cypr., *ep.* lxviii.)[2] for the history of the Gothic church, which reaches us from the middle of the third century, is certainly touched upon by Duchesne, but he has not done it full justice. This letter of Cyprian to the Roman bishop Stephen, which aims at persuading the latter to depose Marcian, the bishop of Arles, who held to Novatian's ideas, opens with the words: "Faustinus, our colleague, residing at Lyons, has written to me repeatedly with information which I know you also have received both from him and also from the rest of our fellow-bishops established in the same province" ("Faustinus collega noster Lugduni consistens semel adque iterum mihi scripsit

[1] Merely for the sake of completeness be it added that the *Liber Prædestinatus* mentions "Diodorus episc. Cretensis" (xii.), "Dioscurus Cretensis episc." (xx.), "Craton episc. Syrorum" (xxxiii.), "Aphrodisius Hellesponti episc." (xlvii.), "Basilius episc. Cappadociae" (xlviii.), "Zeno Syrorum episc." (l.), and "Theodotus Cyprius episc." (lvi.).

[2] See page 68.

significans ea quae etiam vobis scio utique nuntiata tam ab eo quam a ceteris coepiscopis nostris in eadem provincia constitutis"). It is extremely unlikely that by "eadem provincia" here we are meant to understand the provincia Narbonensis. For, in the first place, Lyons did not lie in that province: in the second place, had the bishops of Narbonensis been themselves opponents of Marcian and desirous of getting rid of him, Cyprian's letter would have been couched in different terms, and it would hardly have been necessary for the three great Western bishops of Lyons, Carthage, and Rome to have intervened: thirdly, Cyprian writes in ch. ii. ("quapropter facere te oportet plenissimas litteras ad coepiscopos nostros in Gallia constitutos, ne ultra Marcianum pervicacem et superbum . . . . collegio nostro insultare patiantur") "Wherefore it behoves you to write at great length to our fellow-bishops established in Gaul, not to tolerate any longer the wanton and insolent insults heaped by Marcian . . . . upon our assembly": and in ch. iii. ("dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litterae quibus abstento Marciano alius in loco eius substituatur"): "Let letters be sent by you to the province and to the people residing at Arles, to remove Marcian, and put another person in his place." Obviously, then, it is a question here of two (or three) letters, *i.e.* of one addressed to the bishops of Gaul, and of a second (or even a third) addressed not only to the "plebs Arelate consistens," but also to the "provincia" (which can only mean the provincia Narbonensis, in which Arles lay). It follows from this that the "coepiscopi nostri in Gallia constituti" (ii.) are hardly to be identified with

the bishops of Narbonensis, which leads to the further conclusion that these "coepiscopi" are the bishops of the provincia Lugdunensis—a conclusion which in itself appears to be the most natural and obvious explanation of the passage. *The provincia Lugdunensis thus had several bishops in the days of Cyprian, who were already gathered into one synod,*[1] *and corresponded with Rome.* We cannot make out from this passage how old these bishoprics were, but it is at any rate unlikely that all of them had just been founded. In this connection Duchesne also refers to the fact that bishop Verus of Vienna, who was present at the council of Arles in 314, is counted in one ancient list as the fourth bishop of Vienna; which makes the origin of the local bishopric fall hardly earlier than ± 250 A.D. But the list is not ancient. Besides, it is a questionable authority. Even granting that it were reliable, it is quite arbitrary to assume a mean term of eighteen years as the duration of an individual episcopate; while, even supposing that such a calculation were accurate, it would simply follow that Vienna (although situated in the provincia Narbonensis, where even Duchesne admits that bishoprics had been founded in earlier days) did not receive her bishopric till later. No inference could be drawn from this regarding the town of Lyons.

On 2. Duchesne holds that the heading of the letter (in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 1: *οἱ ἐν Βιέννῃ καὶ Λουγδούνῳ τῆς Γαλλίας παροικοῦντες δοῦλοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) seems to describe the Christians of Vienna and Lyons as if they were

[1] For this must be the meaning of Cyprian's phrase, "tam a Faustino quam a ceteris coepiscopis nostris in eadem provincia constitutis."

a single church. But if such were the case, one would expect Lyons to be put first, since it was Lyons and not Vienna which had a bishop. Besides, the letter does not speak of *ἐκκλησίαι* or *ἐκκλησία* but of *δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ*, just as the address of the letter mentions "the brethren in Asia and Phrygia" (*οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν καὶ Φρυγίαν ἀδελφοί*) and not "churches" at all. Hence nothing at all can be gathered from this passage regarding the organization of the local Christians. Though Vienna and Lyons belonged to different provinces, they lay very close together; and as the same calamity had befallen the Christians of both places, one can quite understand how they write a letter in common on that subject.

On 3. "Their whole fury was aroused exceedingly against Sanctus the deacon from Vienna" (*ἐνέσκηψεν ἡ ὀργὴ πᾶσα εἰς Σάγκτον τὸν*[1] *διάκονον ἀπὸ Βιέννης*). It is possible to take this, with Duchesne, as referring to a certain Sanctus who managed the inchoate church of Vienna, as a delegate of the Lyons bishop. But the explanation is far from certain. This sense of *ἀπό* is unusual (though not intolerable),[2] and the words may quite well be rendered, "the deacon who came from Vienna" [sc. the church of Lyons].[3] But

[1] So we must read the passage, although *τόν* is omitted by AE^{a} F^{b} Nic.

[2] Cp. Eus., *H.E.*, v. 19; Αἴλιος Πούπλιος Ἰούλιος *ἀπὸ Δεβελτοῦ κολωνείας τῆς Θράκης ἐπίσκοπος* ("Aelius Publius Julius, bishop of Debeltum, a colony of Thrace"). The parallel, of course, is not decisive, as Julius was at a gathering in Phrygia when he penned these words.

[3] Cp. what immediately follows—"against Attalus a native of Pergamum" (*εἰς Ἄτταλον Περγαμηνὸν τῷ γένει*), and also § 49 (*Ἀλέξανδρος τις, Φρὺξ μὲν τὸ γένος, ἰατρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐπιστήμην* = a

even supposing that Sanctus was described here as the deacon of Vienna, it seems to me hasty and precarious to infer, with Duchesne, that Vienna had only a single deacon and no bishop (not even a presbyter) at all. Surely this is to build too much upon the article before *διάκονον*. Of course, it may be so; we shall come back to this passage later on. Meantime, suffice it to say that the explicit description of Pothinus in the letter as "entrusted with the bishopric *of Lyons*" (*τὴν διακονίαν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς ἐν Λουγδούνῳ πεπιστευμένος*), instead of as "*our* bishop" or even "*the* bishop," does not tell in favour of the hypothesis that Lyons alone, and not Vienna, had a bishop at that period.

On 4. The passage from Iren., i. 10. 2 (*καὶ οὔτε αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἄλλως πεπιστεύκασιν ἢ ἄλλως παραδιδόασιν, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς Ἰβηρίαις, οὔτε ἐν Κελτοῖς, οὔτε κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς οὔτε ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, οὔτε ἐν Λιβύῃ οὔτε αἱ κατὰ μέσα τοῦ κόσμου ἱδρυμέναι* = Nor did the churches planted in Germany hold any different faith or tradition, any more than do those in Iberia or in Gaul or in the East or in Egypt or in Libya or in the central region of the world) remains neutral when read by the light of a very sceptical exposition. The language affords no clue to the way in which the churches in Germany and among the Celts were organized. But the most obvious interpretation is that these "churches" were just as entire and complete in

certain Alexander, of Phrygian extraction, and a physician by profession). Neumann, in his *Röm. Staat und die allgem. Kirche*, i. (1890), p. 30, writes thus: "As Sanctus, the deacon of Vienna, appears before the tribunal of the legate of Lyons, he was arrested in Lyons."

themselves as the churches of the East, of Egypt, of Libya, and of all Europe, which are mentioned with them on the same level. At any rate nothing can be inferred from this passage in support of Duchesne's opinion. It is a pure "petitio principii" to hold that complete churches could not have existed in Germany.

On 5. No weight attaches to Theodore's evidence regarding the primitive age. Yet even he presupposes that after the exit of the "apostles" (= provincial bishops) each separate province had two or three bishops of its own, while Duchesne would prove that the three Gauls had merely one bishop between them for about a hundred years.

On 6. At first sight, this argument seems to be particularly decisive, but on a closer examination it proves untenable, and in fact turns round in exactly an opposite direction. The expression τῶν κατὰ . . . . ἐπεσκόπει cannot, we are told, be understood to mean episcopal dioceses over which Irenæus presided as metropolitan, but simply denotes scattered groups of Christians (though in the immediate context ἡ παροικία does mean an episcopal diocese), as ἐπισκοπεῖν need only imply direct episcopal functions. Yet in *H.E.*, vii. 26. 3, Eusebius describes Basilides as ὁ κατὰ τὴν Πεντάπολιν παροικιῶν ἐπίσκοπος (see (11)), and Meletius (*H.E.*, vii. 32, 26; cp. (10)) as τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος, and it is quite certain—even on the testimony of Eusebius himself—that there were several bishoprics at that period in Pentapolis and Pontus.[1] Ἐπίσκοπος παροικιῶν, *therefore, denotes in this connection the position*

[1] In this very chapter Eusebius mentions the bishopric of Berenicê in Pentapolis.

of metropolitan,[1] and it is in this sense that παροικίας ἐπισκοιπεῖν must also be understood with reference to Irenæus. The latter, Eusebius meant, was metropolitan of the episcopal dioceses in Gaul. So far from proving, then, that about 100 A.D. there was only one bishop in Gaul, *our passage is evidence for the existence of several bishops.*[2]

On 7. This argument is quite untenable. The church of Pontus, we are told, had its episcopal headquarters in the Galatian Ancyra about 200 A.D.! But about 190 A.D. it already had a metropolitan of its own, for Eusebius mentions a writing sent during the Paschal controversy by "the bishops in Pontus over whom Palmas, as their senior, presided" (τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο, *H.E.*, v. 23). How Duchesne could overlook this passage is all the more surprising, inasmuch as a little above he quotes from this very chapter. Besides, this Palmas, as we may learn from Dionysius of Corinth (in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23. 6; see below, p. 89), stayed not in Ancyra, perhaps, but in Amastris.

[1] On Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 2. 2, see below (p. 90).

[2] Thus the expression used by Eusebius in *H.E.*, v. 24. 11 (ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐκ προσώπου ὧν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστείλας —cp. (6)) is also to be understood as a reference to the metropolitan rank of Irenæus, since it is employed as a simple equivalent for the above expression in v. 23. Probst (*Kirchliche Disziplin in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*, p. 97) and some other scholars even go the length of including Gallic *bishops* among the ἀδελφοί, an interpretation which is not necessary, although it is possible, and rests on one strong piece of evidence in the "parishes" of v. 23.—The outcome of both passages relating to Irenæus and Gaul is that it is impossible to ascertain whether the Meruzanes mentioned in *H.E.* vi. 46 as the bishop of the Armenian brethren was the sole local bishop at that period or the metropolitan. See on (6).

Furthermore, in the passage in question τόπον (AE[a]) must be read[1] instead of Πόντον, despite the Syriac version. Πόντον is meaningless here, even if the territorial bishop of Pontus resided at that time in Ancyra. Thus it is not in Pontus, but in Phrygia and Gaul, that we hear of Montanist agitations, and, moreover, one could not possibly have got acquainted with the church of Pontus in Ancyra, even if the latter place had been the residence of that church's head. Can one get acquainted in Alexandria nowadays with the church of Abyssinia?

On 8. Duchesne's final argument proves nothing, because it is uncertain whether the four recent provinces mentioned here had still no bishops by 314 A.D. Nothing can be based on the fact that they were not represented at Arles, for the representation of churches at the great synods always was an extremely haphazard affair. But even supposing that these provinces were still without bishops of their own, this proves nothing with regard to Lyons.

I have added to Duchesne's reasons fourteen other passages which appear to favour his hypothesis. Three of these (6), (10), (11) have been already noticed under 6., and our conclusion was that they were silent upon provincial bishops, being concerned rather with metropolitans. It remains for us to review briefly the other eleven.

We must not infer from 2 Cor. i. 1 that, when

[1] Προσφάτως γενόμενος ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας καὶ καταλαβὼν τὴν κατὰ τόπον (not Πόντον) ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τῆς νέας ταύτης . . . . ψευδοπροφητείας διατεθρυλημένην ("When I was recently at Ancyra in Galatia, I found the local church quite upset by this novel form . . . . of false prophecy"). Κατὰ Πόντον is in one other passage of Eusebius a mistake for κατὰ πάντα τόπον (iv. 15. 2).

Paul wrote this epistle, all the Christians of Achaia belonged to the church of Corinth. In Rom. xvi. 1 f. Paul mentions a certain Phœbê, *διάκονος τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς*, speaking highly of her as having been a *προστάτις πολλῶν καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ*, so that, while many Christians scattered throughout Achaia may have also belonged to the church at Corinth at that period, there was nevertheless a church at Cenchreæ besides, which we have no reason to suppose was not independent.

Ignatius's description of himself as "bishop of Syria," and his description of the church of Antioch as *ἡ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, appear to prove decisively that there was only one bishop then in Syria, viz., at Antioch (2). Yet in *ad Phil.* x. we read how some of the neighbouring churches sent *bishops*, others presbyters and deacons, to Antioch (*ὡς καὶ αἱ ἔγγιστα ἐκκλησίαι ἔπεμψαν ἐπισκόπους, αἱ δὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους*), which shows that there were bishoprics[1] in Syria, and indeed in the immediate vicinity of Antioch, *c.* 115 A.D. The bishop of Antioch called himself "bishop of Syria" on account of his *metropolitan position.*

From Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23. 5–6, it would appear that there was only a single bishop (3), (4), in Crete and in Pontus *c.* 170 A.D., inasmuch as Dionysius of Corinth designates Philip as bishop of Gortyna *and the rest of the churches in Crete*, and Palmas bishop of Amastris

[1] Some of the bishoprics adjoining Antioch, of which Eusebius speaks in *H.E.* vii. 30. 10 (*ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων*), were therefore in existence by *c.* 115 A.D.—It seems to me impossible that Philadelphia is referred to in the expression *αἱ ἔγγιστα ἐκκλησίαι* in *Phil.* x. ("the nearest churches"). Even Lightfoot refers it to Syria. To be quite accurate he ought to have said, "to the church in Antioch," as that church is mentioned just above.

and the churches of Pontus. But whether the expression be attributed to Dionysius himself, or ascribed, as is more likely, to Eusebius, the fact remains that the same collection of the letters of Dionysius contained one to the church of Cnossus in Crete, or *to its bishop Pinytus* (*loc. cit.*, § 7), while, as we have already seen (on 7), Palmas was not the sole bishop in Pontus. Philip and Palmas were therefore not provincial bishops but metropolitans, with other bishops at their side.

The statement of Eusebius (5) that Titus was bishop of the Cretan churches is an erroneous inference from Titus i. 5, and destitute of historical value.

According to the habitual terminology of Eusebius (7), τῶν δὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ παροικιῶν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τότε Δημήτριος ὑπειλήφει describes Demetrius as a metropolitan, not as a provincial bishop (see above, on (6)). Other evidence, discussed by Lightfoot (in his *Commentary on Philippians*, 3d ed., pp. 228 f.) would seem to render it probable that Demetrius was really the only bishop (in the monarchical sense) in Egypt in 188–189 A.D.; but this fact is no proof whatever that the Alexandrian bishop was a "provincial" bishop, for it does not preclude the possibility that, while Demetrius was the first monarchical bishop in Alexandria itself, Egypt in general did not contain any churches up till then except those which were superintended by presbyters or deacons. The whole circumstances of the situation are of course extremely obscure. Nevertheless it does look as if Demetrius and his successor Heraclas were the first bishops (in the proper sense of the term), and as if they ordained similar bishops (Demetrius ordained

three, and Heraclas twenty) for Egypt. It is perfectly possible, no doubt, but at the same time it is incapable of proof, that the Egyptian churches occupied a position of dependence on the Alexandrian church, at a time when Alexandria itself had as yet no bishop of its own.

In both of the passages (8) and (9) where Gregory and Athenodorus are described as *bishops of the Pontic church*, the dual number shows that we have to do neither with provincial nor with metropolitan bishops. Eusebius is expressing himself vaguely, perhaps because he did not know the bishoprics of the two men.

In Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 13, 4–5, two bishops who happen to bear the same name ("Silvanus") are described as bishops of the churches "round Emesa," or "round Gaza" (12). There can be no word of provincial bishops here, however, as we know that these districts contained a large number of bishoprics. The position of matters can be understood from the history of Emesa and Gaza, both of which remained for long pagan towns, as we are aware; they would not tolerate a Christian bishop. Bishops, therefore, were unable to reside in either place. But as the groups of Christian villages in the vicinity had bishops for themselves (so essential did the episcopal organization seem to Eastern Christians), there were probably bishops *in partibus infidelium* for Emesa and Gaza, although otherwise they were territorial bishops, over quite a limited range of territory.

As regards provincial bishops, it seems possible to cite the signatures to the council of Nicæa (13), viz., the five instances in which the name of the province

accompanies that of the bishop. These are Calabria, Thessaly, Pannonia, Gothia, and the Bosphorus.[1] But in the case of Thessaly, bishop Claudianus of Thessaly is accompanied by bishop Cleonicus of Thebes, so that the former was not a provincial bishop but a metropolitan. Besides, it is quite certain that Calabria and Pannonia had more than one bishop in 325 A.D., although only the metropolitans of these provinces were present at Nicæa (as indeed was also the case with Africa, whose metropolitan alone was in attendance). Thus only Gothia and the Bosphorus are left. But as these lay outside the Roman empire, and as quite a unique set of conditions prevailed throughout these regions, the local situation there cannot form any standard for estimating the organization of churches inside the empire. The bishops above mentioned may have been the only bishops there.

No value whatever attaches to the statements of the *Apost. Constit.* (14) and of the *Liber Predestinatus.* The former are based, so far as regards the first half of them, upon an arbitrary deduction from 2 Tim. iv. 10, while their second half is utterly futile, since several Asiatic city bishoprics are mentioned in the context. The latter statement is a description of *metropolitans* (*i.e.* so far as any idea whatever can be ascribed to the forger), as is proved abundantly by the entry, "Basilius, bishop of Cappadocia." Finally, the communication of Sozomen (15), which he himself describes as a curiosity, refers to a barbarian country.

[1] The signature Δαρδανίας· Δάκος Μακεδονίας is obscure, and must therefore be set aside.

The result is, therefore, that the alleged evidence for the hypothesis of provincial bishops instead of local (city) bishops and metropolitans throughout the empire, furnishes no proof at all. Out of all the material which we have examined, nothing is left to favour this conjecture. The sole outcome of it is the unimportant possibility that in 178 A.D. (and even till about the middle of third century), Vienna had no independent bishop of its own. Even this conjecture, as has been shown, is far from necessary, while it is opposed by the definite testimony of Eusebius, who knew of a letter from the parishes of Gaul *c.* 190 A.D.[1] And even supposing it were to the point, we

[1] If there were several (episcopal) parishes in Gaul *c.* 190 A.D., Vienna would also form one such parish. The hypothesis that a number of bishoprics existed in middle and northern Gaul in the days of Irenæus is confirmed by the fact that Irenæus (in a passage i. 10, to which I shall return) speaks, not of Christians in Germany, but of "*the churches founded in Germany.*" Would he have spoken of them if these churches had not had any bishops? While if they did possess bishops of their own—and according to iii. 3. 1, the episcopal succession reaching back to the apostles could be traced in *every individual church*,—then how should there have been still no bishops in middle and northern Gaul?

The passage iii. 3. 1 runs thus: "Traditionem apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint videre, et habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis et successiones eorum usque ad nos. . . . Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones," etc. ("All who desire to see facts can clearly see the tradition of the apostles, which is manifested all over the world, *in every church*; and we are able to enumerate those whom the apostles appointed as bishops in the churches, as well as to recount their line of succession down to our own day. . . . Since, however, in a volume of this kind it would take up great space to enumerate the various lines of succession throughout all the churches," etc.).

should have to suppose that the Christians in Vienna were numbered, not by hundreds, but merely by dozens, about the year 178, *i.e.* some decades later still.

It is certain (cp. pp. 54 f.) that an internal tension prevailed between two forms of organization during the first two generations of the Christian propaganda. These forms were (1) the church as a missionary church, created by a missionary or apostle, whose work it remained; and (2) the church as a local church, complete in itself, forming thus an image and expression of the church in heaven. As the creation of an apostolic missionary, the church was responsible to its founder, dependent upon him, and obliged to maintain the principles which he followed everywhere in the course of his activity as a founder of various churches. As a compact local church, again, it was responsible for itself, with no one over it save the Lord in heaven. Through the person of its earthly founder, it stood in a real relationship to the other churches which he had founded. But as a local church it stood by itself, and any connection with other churches was quite a voluntary matter.

That the founders themselves desired the churches to be independent, is perfectly clear in the case of Paul, nor have we any reason to believe that other founders of churches took another view (cp. the Roman church). No doubt they still continued to give pedagogic counsels to the churches, and in fact to act as guardians to them. But this was exceptional; it was not the rule. The Spirit moved them to such action, and their apostolic authority justified them in it, while the unfinished state of the communi-

ties seemed to demand it.[1] And in the primitive decision upon the length of time that an apostle was to remain in a community, as in similar cases, the communities secured, *ipso facto*, a means of self-protection within their own jurisdiction. Probably the completed organization of the Jerusalem church became, *mutatis mutandis*, a pattern for all and sundry: Christian communities were not "churches of Paul" or "of Peter" (ἐκκλησίαι Παύλου, Πέτρου), but each was a "church of God" (ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ).

The third epistle of John affords one certain proof that conflict was not awanting between the community and its local management upon the one hand and the "apostles" on the other. This same John (or, in the view of many critics, a different person) does not impart his counsels to the Asiatic communities directly. He makes the "Spirit" utter them. He proclaims, not his own coming with a view to punish them, but the coming of the Lord as their judge. But we need not enter more particularly into these circumstances and conditions. The point is that the apostolic authority soon faded; nor was it transmuted as a whole, for all that passed over to the monarchical episcopate was but a limited portion of its contents.

The apostolic authority and praxis afforded a certain means of uniting several communities in a single group. When it vanished, the association also simply ceased to be. But another kind of tie was now furnished to the communities of a single

[1] What they did, the churches also did themselves in certain circumstances. Thus the Roman church exhorted, and in fact acted as guardian to, the Corinthian church in one sore crisis (*c.* 96 A.D.).

province by their provincial association, and proofs of this are given by the Pauline epistles and the Apocalypse of John. The Epistle to the Galatians, addressed to all the Christian communities of Galatia, falls to be considered in this aspect, and much more besides. Paul's range of missionary activity was regulated by the provinces; Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, etc., were ever in his mind's eye. He prosecutes the great work of his collection by massing together the communities of a single province, and the so-called epistle "to the Ephesians" is addressed, as many scholars opine, to a large number of the Asiatic communities. John writes to the churches of Asia.[1] Even at an earlier period a letter had been sent (Acts xv.) from Jerusalem to the churches of Syria and Cilicia.[2] The communities of Judæa were so closely bound up with that of Jerusalem, as to give rise to the hypothesis (Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi. p. 300) that the ancient episcopal list of Jerusalem, which contains a surprising number of names, is a conflate list of the Jerusalem bishops and of those from the other Christian communities in Palestine. Between the apostolic age and *c.* 180 A.D., when we first get evidence of provincial church synods, similar proofs of union among the provincial churches are not infrequent. Ignatius is concerned, not only for the church of Antioch, but for that of Syria; Dionysius of Corinth writes to the communities of Crete and to

[1] By addressing himself also to the church at Laodicea, he passes on into the neighbouring district of Phrygia. But the other six churches are all Asiatic.

[2] The collocation of Christians from several large provinces in 1 Peter is remarkable. But as the address of this letter has been possibly drawn up artificially, I do not take it here into account.

those in Pontus; the brethren of Lyons write to those in Asia and Phrygia; the Egyptian communities form a sphere complete in itself, and the churches of Asia present themselves to more than Irenæus as a unity.

Not in all cases did a definite town, such as the capital, become the headquarters which dominated the ecclesiastical province. No doubt Jerusalem (while it lasted), Antioch,[1] Corinth,[2] Rome, Carthage, and Alexandria formed not merely the centres of their respective provinces, but in part extended their sway still more widely, both in virtue of their importance as large cities, and also on account of the energetic Christianity which they displayed.[3] Yet Ephesus, for example, did not become for a long while the ecclesiastical metropolis of Asia in the full sense of the term; Smyrna and other cities competed with it for this honour.[4] In Palestine, Aelia (Jerusalem) and Cæsarea stood side by side. Certain provinces, like

[1] Cp. the very significant address in Acts xv. 23: οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς. It matters not, for our present purpose, whether the letter is genuine or not.

[2] According to the extract from the correspondence of Dionysius of Corinth, given by Eusebius (*H.E.*, IV. xxiii.), the bishop of Corinth seems to have stood in a different relation to the churches of Lacedæmon and Athens from that in which he stood towards communities lying outside Greece.

[3] This requires no proof, as regards Rome. But the church of Jerusalem also pushed far beyond Palestine; it gave Paul much trouble in the Diaspora, and tried even to balk his plans. The bishop of Antioch, again, reached out to Cilicia, Mesopotamia, and Persia; the bishop of Carthage to Mauretania; the bishop of Alexandria to Pentapolis.

[4] All this was connected, of course, with the political organization of Asia.

Galatia and extensive districts of Cappadocia, had no outstanding towns at all, and when we are told that in the provinces of Pontus, Numidia, and Spain, the *oldest* bishop always presided at the episcopal meetings, the inference is that no single city could have enjoyed a position of superiority to the others from the ecclesiastical standpoint.

But the question now arises, whether the "metropolitans," who had been long in existence before they were recognized by the law of the church or attained their rights and authority, in any way repressed the tendency towards the increase of independent communities within a province; and further, whether, in the interests of their own power, the bishops also made any attempt to retard the organization of new *independent* communities under episcopal government. In itself such a course of action would not be surprising. For wherever authority and rights develop, ambition and the love of power invariably are unchained.

In order to solve the problem thus set before us, we have first of all to remark that the tendency of early Christianity to form complete, independent communities, *under episcopal government*, was extremely strong.[1] *Furthermore, I do not know of*

[1] As Ignatius cannot conceive of a community existing at all without a bishop, so Cyprian also opines that a bishop is absolutely necessary to every community; without him its very being appears to break up (see especially *ep.* lxvi. 5). The tendencies voiced by Ignatius in his epistles led to every Christian community in a locality, however small it might be, having a bishop chosen, and we have every reason to suppose that the practice which already obtained in Syria and Asia corresponded to these tendencies. From the outset we observe that local churches spring into life

a single case, from the first three centuries, which would lead us to infer any tendency, either upon the part of metropolitans or of bishops, to curb the independent organization of the churches. Not till after the opening of the fourth century does the conflict against the chor-episcopate commence; at least there is not a trace of it, so far as I know, to be found previous to that period. And it is then also that the bishops begin their attempt to prohibit the erection of bishoprics in the villages, as well as to secure the discontinuance of bishoprics in small

everywhere, as opposed to uncertain transient unions, and while Christians might and did group themselves in other forms (*e.g.*, mere guilds of worship and schools of thought), these were always attacked and suppressed. Neighbouring cities, like Laodicea, Colossê, and Hierapolis, had churches of their own from the very first. So had the seaport of Corinth, as early as the days of Paul, while the localities closely "adjacent to" Antioch (Syr.) had churches of their own in Trajan's reign (Ignat., *ad Phil.* x.), and not long afterwards we have evidence of village churches also. Then, as soon as we hear of the monarchical episcopate, it is in relation to small communities. The localities which lay near Antioch had their own bishops, and two decades afterwards we find a bishop quartered in the Phrygian village of Comana (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16). The Nicene Council was attended by village bishops from Syria, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Isauria, who had the same rights as the town bishops. In the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* (middle of second century) we read: "If the number of men be small, and twelve persons cannot be found at one place, who are entitled to elect a bishop, let application be made to any of the nearest churches which is well established, so that three chosen men may be sent who shall carefully ascertain who is worthy," etc. Which assumes that even in such cases a complete or episcopal church results. We must therefore assume that it was the rule, in some at least, and probably in many, of the provinces to give every community a bishop. Thus the number of the local churches or communities would practically be equivalent to the number of the bishoprics.

neighbouring townships—all with the view of increasing their own dioceses.[1]

Furthermore, we have not merely an "argumentum e silentio" before us here. On the contrary, after surveying (as we shall do in Book IV.) the Christian churches which can be traced *circa* 325 A.D., we see that it is quite impossible for any tendency to have prevailed throughout the large majority of the

[1] The chor-episcopi were first of all deprived of certain rights retained by the town bishops, including especially the right of ordination. Then they were ultimately rendered extinct. The main stages of this struggle throughout the East are seen from the following series of decisions. Canon xiii. of the Council of Ancyra (314 A.D.): χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν ("chor-episcopi are not allowed to elect presbyters or deacons"). Canon xiii. of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea: οἱ χωρεπίσκοποι εἰσι μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα· ὡς δὲ συλλειτουργοὶ διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν τὴν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς προσφέρουσι τιμώμενοι ("The chor-episcopi are indeed on the pattern of the Seventy, and they are to have the honour of making the oblation, as fellow labourers, on account of their devotion to the poor"). Canon viii. of the Council of Antioch (341 A.D.): "Country priests are not to issue letters of peace [*i.e.* certificates]; they are only to forward letters to the neighbouring bishop. Blameless chor-episcopi, however, can grant letters of peace." *Ibid.*, canon x.: "Even if bishops in villages and country districts, the so-called chor-episcopi, have been consecrated as bishops, they must recognize the limits of their position. Let them govern the churches under their sway and be content with this charge and care, appointing lectors and sub-deacons and exorcists; let them be satisfied with expediting such business, but never dare to ordain priest or deacon without the bishop of the town to whom the rural bishop and the district itself belong. Should anyone dare to contravene these orders, he shall be deprived of the position which he now holds. A rural bishop shall be appointed by the bishop of the town to which he belongs." Canon vi. of the Council of Sardica (343 A.D.): μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἁπλῶς καθιστᾶν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει, ᾗτινι καὶ εἷς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ. οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἐπισκόπους ἐκεῖσε καθίστασθαι, ἵνα μὴ κατευτελίζηται τὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὄνομα καὶ ἡ αὐθεντία, ἀλλ' οἱ τῆς ἐπαρχίας

Roman provinces which would check the formation of bishoprics, inasmuch as almost all the churches in question can be proved to have been episcopal. We are led to conclude, then, that *wherever communities, episcopally governed, were scanty, Christians were also scanty upon the whole; while, if a town had no bishop at all, the number of local Christians was insignificant.* Certainly in the course of the Christian mission, in several directions, whole decades passed without more

ἐπίσκοποι ἐν ταύταις ταῖς πόλεσι καθιστᾶν ἐπισκόπους ὀφείλουσιν, ἔνθα καὶ πρότερον ἐτύγχανον γεγονότες ἐπίσκοποι. εἰ δὲ εὑρίσκοιτο οὕτω πληθύνουσά τις ἐν πολλῷ ἀριθμῷ λαοῦ πόλις, ὡς ἀξίαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐπισκοπῆς νομίζεσθαι, λαμβανέτω ("It is absolutely forbidden to ordain a bishop in any village or small town for which even a single presbyter is sufficient—for it is needless to ordain bishops there—lest the name and authority of bishops be made of small account. But the bishops of the provinces ought to appoint bishops in those cities where there were bishops previously; and if any city be found to contain a population large enough to merit a see, then let one be founded there"). Canon lvii. of the Council of Laodicea: "In villages and country districts no bishops shall be appointed, but only visitors (περιοδευταί), nor shall those already appointed act without the consent of the city bishop." By the opening of the fifth century this process had gone to such a length that Sozomen (*H.E.*, vii. 19) notes, as a curiosity, that "there are cases where in other nations bishops do the work of priests in villages, as I myself have seen in Arabia and Cyprus and in Phrygia among the Novatians and Montanists" (ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσίν ἐστιν ὅπη καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀραβίοις καὶ Κύπροις ἔγνων καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐν Φρυγίαις Ναυατιανοῖς καὶ Μοντανισταῖς). In Northern Africa, upon the other hand, no measures were taken against the smaller bishops. Augustine himself (*ep.* cclxi.) erected a new bishopric within his own diocese, whilst even after the year 400 it is plain that the number of bishoprics in Northern Africa went on increasing. We may take it that in provinces where the village bishoprics were numerous (*i.e.* in the majority of the provinces of Asia Minor, besides Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, and Cyprus), the total number of bishoprics did not materially increase after 325 A.D. Probably, indeed, it even diminished.

than one bishop in a province or in an extensive tract of country. We might also conjecture, *a priori*, that wherever a district was uncultivated or destitute of towns—as on the confines of the empire and beyond them—years passed without a single bishop being appointed, the scattered local Christians being superintended by the bishop of the nearest town, which was perhaps far away. It is quite credible that, even after a fully-equipped hierarchy had been set up in such an outlying district, this bishop should have retained certain rights of supervision—for it is a question here, not simply of personal desire for power, but of rights which had been already acquired. Still, it is well-nigh impossible for us nowadays to gain any clear insight into circumstances of this kind, since after the second century all such cases were treated and recorded from the standpoint of a dogmatic theory of ecclesiastical polity—the theory that the right of ordination was a monopoly of the original apostles, and consequently that all bishoprics were to be traced back, either directly to them, or to men whom they themselves appointed. The actual facts of the great mission promoted by Antioch (as far as Persia, eastwards), Alexandria (into the Thebais, Libya, Pentapolis, and eventually Ethiopia), and Rome, appeared to corroborate this theory. The authenticated instances from ancient history (for we have no detailed knowledge of the Bosphorus or of Gothia) permit us to calculate, *e.g.*, that the power of ordination possessed by the bishop of Alexandria extended over four provinces. Still, as has been remarked already, the original circumstances remain obscure. It is relevant

also at this point to notice the tradition, possibly an authentic one, that the first bishop of Edessa was consecrated by the bishop of Antioch (*Doctr. Addaei*, p. 50), and that the Persian church was for a long while dependent upon the church of Antioch, from which it drew its metropolitans.[1] But even when this was in force, the imperial church had already firmly embraced the theory that episcopal ordination could only be perpetuated within the apostolic succession.

There are also instances, of course, in which, during the third century (for, apart from Egypt, no sure proofs can be adduced at an earlier period), Christian communities arose in country districts which were superintended by presbyters or even by deacons alone, instead of by a bishop. Such cases, however, are far from numerous.[2] They are infrequent till in and after

[1] Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer* (1880), p. 46; and Uhlemann, *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol.* (1861), p. 15. But the primitive history of Christianity in Persia lies wrapt in obscurity, or buried in legends.

[2] No case is known, so far as I am aware, during the pre-Constantine period in Northern Africa. One might infer, from epistles i. and lviii. of Cyprian, that there were no bishops at Furni and Thibaris, but from *sentent. episcop.* (59 and 37) it is evident that even these churches were ruled by one bishop. Probably the see was vacant when Cyprian wrote epistle i.; but this hypothesis is needless so far as regards ep. lviii. The reference to Cypr. *ep.* lxviii. 5 is extremely insecure. It is unlikely that even in Middle and Lower Italy churches existed without bishops during the third century. We must not argue from *cpp.* 4 and 7 of the letter written by Firmilian of Iconium (Cypr., *ep.* lxxv.) in favour of churches without bishops, surprising as is the expression "seniores et praepositi" or "praesident maiores natu." But there was such a church at the village of Malus near Ancyra (see *Acta Mart. Theodot.*, 11. 12).

the age of Diocletian.[1] Before then, so far as I know, there was but one large district in which presbyterial organization was indeed the rule, viz., Egypt. Yet, as has been already observed, the circumstances of Egypt are most obscure. It is highly probable that for a considerable length of time there were no monarchical bishops at all in that country, the separate churches being grouped canton-wise, and superintended by presbyters. Gradually the episcopal organization extended itself during the course of the third century, yet even in the fourth century there were still large village churches which lacked any bishop. We must, however, be on our guard against drawing conclusions from Egypt and applying them to any of the other Roman provinces. It has been inferred, from the subscriptions to the Acts of the synod of Elvira, that some Spanish towns, which were merely represented by presbyters at the synod, did not possess any bishops of their own. This may be so, but the very Acts of the synod clearly show how precarious is the inference; for, while many presbyters subscribed these Acts, it can be proved that in almost every case the town churches which they represented did possess a bishop. The latter was prevented from being present at the synod, and, like the Roman bishop, he had himself represented by a presbyter or deputation of the

[1] We must not, of course, enlist cases in which presbyters or presbyters and deacons ruled a community during an episcopal vacancy. Even though they employed language which can only be described as episcopal (cp. the eighth document of the Roman clergy among Cyprian's letters), they were simply regents; see *ep.* xxx. 8. "We thought that no new step should be taken before a bishop was appointed" (ante constitutionem episcopi nihil innovandum putavimus).

clergy. Nevertheless it is indisputable, on the ground of the sixty-seventh canon of Elvira ("si quis diaconus regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero," etc.), that there were churches in Spain which had not a bishop or even a presbyter, although we know as little about the number of such churches as about the conditions which failed to bring about the appointment of any bishop or presbyter. In any case, the management of a church by a deacon must have always been the exception (mainly an emergency measure in the days of persecution), since it was unlawful for him to perform the holy sacrifice (see the fifteenth canon of Arles). It is impossible to decide whether by the ἐπιχώριοι πρεσβύτεροι mentioned in the thirteenth canon of Neo-Cæsarea we are to understand independent presbyters in country churches or presbyters who had a chor-episcopus over them. Possibly the latter is the true solution, since we must assume a specially vigorous development of the chor-episcopate in the neighbouring country of Cappadocia, which sent no fewer than five chor-episcopi to the council of Nicæa. On the other hand, it follows from the Testament of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste that there were churches in the adjoining district of Armenia which were ruled by a presbyter, and in which no chor-episcopate seems to have existed. Armenia, however, was a frontier province, and we cannot transfer its peculiar circumstances *en masse* to the provinces of Pontus and Cappadocia. The "priests in the country," mentioned in the eighth canon of Antioch (341 A.D.), are certainly priests who had supreme authority in their local spheres, but the synod of Antioch was held in

the post-Constantine period, and the circumstances of 341 A.D. do not furnish any absolute rule for those of an earlier age. It is natural to suppose that the contemporary organization of the cantons in Gaul,[1] which hindered the development of towns, proved also an obstacle to the thorough organization of the episcopal system; so that one might conjecture imperfectly organized churches to have been numerous in that country (as in England). But on this point we know absolutely nothing. And besides, even in the second century there was a not inconsiderable number of towns in Gaul where the local conditions were substantially the same as those which prevailed in the other Roman towns.[2]

It is impossible, therefore, to prove that for whole decades there were territorial or provincial bishops who ruled over a number of dependent Christian churches in the towns; we are rather to assume that if bishops actually did wield episcopal rights in a number of towns, it was in towns where only an infinitesimal number of Christians resided within the walls. Anyone who asserts the contrary with regard to some provinces, cannot be refuted. I admit that.

[1] See Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. 81 f. [Eng. trans., i. 92 f.], and also Marquardt's *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 7 f.

[2] Two systems prevailed in the civil government, as regards the country districts; the latter were either placed under the jurisdiction of a neighbouring town or assigned magistrates of their own (see Hatch-Harnack, *Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen*, p. 202). The latter corresponded to the chor-episcopate, the former to the direct episcopal jurisdiction and administration of the town bishop. The blending of the two systems, with more or less independent country presbyters and reserved rights on the part of the bishop, was the latest development. Its earliest stage falls within the second half of the third century.

But the burden of proof rests with him. The assertion, for example, that Autun, Rheims, Paris, etc., had a fairly large number of Christians by the year 240 or thereabouts, while the local Christian churches had no bishop, cannot be proved incorrect, in the strict sense of the term. We have no materials for such a proof. But all analogy favours the truth, here also, of the conclusion: if the Christians in Autun, Rheims, Paris, etc., were so numerous *circa* 240 A.D., then they had bishops; if they had no bishops, then they were quite scanty. In my opinion, we may put it thus: (1) It is entirely possible, and, indeed, extremely likely (cp. the evidence of Cyprian), that before the middle of the third century there were already some other episcopal churches in Gaul, even apart from the "province"; (2) if Lyons was really the sole episcopal church of the country, then there was only an infinitesimal number of Christians in Gaul outside that city.

We come back now to one of Theodore's remarks. "At the outset," he wrote, "there were but two or three bishops, as a rule, in a province—a state of matters which prevailed in most of the Western provinces till quite recently, and which may still be found in several, even at the present day." This is a statement which yields us no information whatsoever. For Theodore did not know any more than we moderns know about the state of matters "at the outset." The assertion that there were not more than two or three bishops in the *majority* of the Western provinces "till quite recently," is positively incorrect, and only proves how small was Theodore's historical knowledge of the Western churches; and finally, while the information that

several Western provinces even yet had no more than two or three bishops, is accurate, it is irrelevant, since we know, even apart from Theodore's testimony, that the number of bishoprics in the Roman provinces adjoining the large northern frontier of the empire, as well as in England, was but small. But this scantiness of contemporary bishoprics did not denote an earlier (and subsequently suspended) phase of the church's organization tenaciously maintaining itself. What it denoted was one result of the local conditions of the population and also the rarity of Christians in those districts. So far, of course, these local circumstances resembled those in which Christianity subsisted from the very outset over all the empire, when the Christians—and the Romans—of the region lived still in the Diaspora.

At this point we might conclude with the remark that the striking historical paragraph of Theodore does not contain a single element of truth answering to the real position of affairs. But in the course of our study we have over and again touched upon the special position of the metropolitan, or leading bishop of the province. It is perfectly clear, from a number of passages, that the metropolitan was frequently described in the time of Eusebius simply as "the bishop of the province." The leading bishop was thus described even as early as Dionysius of Corinth or Ignatius himself. With regard to the history of the extension of Christianity—in so far as we are concerned to determine the volume of tendency making for the formation of independent churches—the bearing of this fact is really neutral. But it is not neutral with regard to the idea which has to be formed of the

course taken by *the history of ecclesiastical organization.* Unluckily our sources here fail us for the most part. The uncertain glimpses they afford do not permit us to obtain any really historical idea of the situation, or even to reconstruct any course of development along this line. How old is the metropolitan? Is his position connected with a power of ordination which originally passed from but one man to another in the province? Does the origin of the metropolitan's authority go back to a time where the apostles still survived? Does any connection exist here? And are we to distinguish between one bishop and another, so that in the earlier age there would be bishops who did not ordain, or who were merely the vicars of a head bishop?[1] To all these questions we are probably to return a negative answer *in general*, though an affirmative may perhaps be true in one or two cases. Certainty we cannot reach. At least, in spite of repeated exertions, I have not myself succeeded in gaining any tenable position. Frequently the *facts* of the situation may have operated quite as strongly as the rights of the case; *i.e.* an individual bishop may have exercised rights at first and for a considerable period, without possessing any title thereto, but simply as the outcome of a strong position held either on personal grounds or on account of the civic repute and splendour of his town churches.[2] The State provincial organization

[1] One is led to put this question by learning that injunctions were laid down in the fourth century, which delimited the ordination rights of the chor-episcopi (see above, p. 100). Does this restriction go back to an earlier age? Hardly.

[2] One recollects at this point, *e.g.*, the second epistle of Cyprian, mentioned already in vol. i. pp. 218, 235, which tells how the

and administration, with the importance which it lent to individual towns, may have also come to exercise here and there some influence already upon the powers of individual bishops in individual provinces, by way of aggrandisement.[1] But all this pertains, probably, to the sphere of those elements in the situation which we may term "irrational," and which do not admit of generalization or of being applied particularly to ecclesiastical rights and powers within the primitive age. No evidence for the defining of the metropolitan's *right of jurisdiction* can be found earlier than the age in which the synodal organization had defined itself, and the presupposition of such a right lay in the sturdy independence, the substantial equality, and the closely knit union of all the bishops in any given province. All the "preliminary stages" lie enveloped in mist. And the scanty rays which struggle through, may readily prove deceptive will-o'-the wisps.

Carthaginian church was prepared to undertake the support of an erstwhile teacher of the dramatic art, if his own church was not in a position to do so. It is clear that the Carthaginian church or bishop must have acquired a superior position amid the sister provincial churches, if cases of this kind occurred again and again. Compare also the sixty-second epistle, in which the Carthaginian church not only subscribes 100,000 sesterces towards the emancipation of Christians in Africa, who had been carried off captives by the barbarians, but also expresses herself ready to send still more in case of need [cp. vol. i. pp. 232 f.]. It is well known that the repute of the Roman church and its bishops was increased by such donations, which were bestowed frequently, and bestowed even on remote churches.

[1] The instructive investigations of Lübeck ("Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients," in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* herausgeg. von Knöpfler, Schrörs, und Sdralek, Bd. v. Heft 4, 1901) afford many suggestions on this point.

These investigations into the problems connected with the history of the extension of Christianity lead to the following result, viz., that the *number* of bishoprics in the individual provinces of the Roman empire affords a criterion, which is essentially reliable, for estimating the strength of the Christian movement. The one exception is Egypt. Apart from that province, we may say that Christian communities, not episcopally organized, were quite infrequent throughout the East and the West alike during the years that elapsed between Antoninus Pius and Constantine.[1] Not only small towns, but

[1] Previous to the middle of the third century I do not know of a single case (leaving out Egypt). All the evidence that has been gathered from the older period simply shows that there were Christians in the country, or that country people here and there came in to worship in the towns, having therefore no place of worship at home, and consequently no presbyters. Furthermore, the original character of the presbyter's office, a character which can be traced down into the third century, simply does not permit any differentiation among the individual, independent presbyters, each of whom was a presbyter as being the member of a college and nothing more (cp. also Hatch-Harnack, *Gesellschaft. der christlichen Kirchen*, pp. 76 f., 200 f.; the right of presbyters to baptize was originally a transmitted right and nothing more. Hatch refers the rise of parishes also to a later time). I should conjecture that the organization of presbyterial village churches began first of all when the town congregation in the largest towns had been divided into presbyters' and deacons' districts, and when the individual presbyters had thus become relatively independent. In Rome this distribution arose rather later than the middle of the third century, and originally it went back to the division into civic quarters (not to the synagogue). The necessity of having clergy appointed for the country, even where there were no bishops, emerged further throughout the East wherever a martyr's grave or even a churchyard had to be looked after (cp. the Testament of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste). Again, we know from the history of Gregory Thaumaturgus and other sources (cp. the *Acta Theodoti Ancyr.*) that after the middle of the

villages also had bishops. Cyprian made a substantially accurate remark when he wrote to Antonian (*ep.* lv. 24): "Iam pridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sunt episcopi" ("bishops have been for long ordained throughout all the provinces and in each city").[1] And what was unique in the age of Sozomen (*H.E.*, vii. 19), viz. that only one bishop ruled in Scythia,

third century the great movement had begun which sought to appropriate and consecrate as Christian the sacred sites and cults of paganism throughout the country, as well as to build shrines for the relics of the saints. In these cases also a presbyter, or at least a deacon, was required, in order to take care of the sanctuary. Finally, the severe persecutions of Decius, Valerian, Diocletian, and Maximinus Daza drove thousands of Christians to take refuge in the country; the last-named emperor, moreover, deliberately endeavoured to eject Christians from the towns, and condemned thousands to hard labour in the mines throughout the country. We know, thanks to the information of Dionysius of Alexandria and Eusebius, that in such cases communities sprang up in the country districts for the purpose of worship, and these naturally were without a bishop, unless one happened to be among their number. It may be supposed that all these circumstances combined to mature the organization of presbyterial communities, an organization which subsequently, under the countenance of the town bishops, entered upon a victorious course of rivalry with the old chor-episcopate. Frequently, however, in the country the nucleus lay, not in the community, but in the sacred sites—and such were in existence even before the adoption and consecration of pagan ones, in the shape of martyrs' graves and churchyards. These considerations lead me to side with Thomassin in the controversy between that critic and Binterim: the "country parish" did not begin its slow process of development till after about 250 A.D.

[1] With this reservation, that in certain provinces the tendency to form independent communities proceeded more actively than in others. This, however, is purely a matter of conjecture; it cannot be strictly proved. The episcopal churches of the third century were most numerous in North Africa, Palestine, Syria,

though it had many towns[1]—this would also have been unique a century and a half earlier.

In conclusion, let it be remembered that the whole of this investigation relates solely to the age between Pius and Constantine, not to the primitive period during which the monarchical episcopate first began to develop. During this period—which lasted in certain provinces till Domitian and Trajan, and in many others still longer—the collegiate government of the individual church, by means of bishops and deacons (or by means of a college of presbyters, bishops, and deacons), was the rule. How this passed over into the other (*i.e.* the monarchic control) we need not ask in this connection. But the hypothesis that wherever communities which are not episcopally organized are to be found throughout the third century, they are to be considered as having retained the primitive organization—this hypothesis, I repeat, is not merely incapable of proof, but incorrect. Such non-episcopal village churches are plainly *recent* churches, and they are managed, not by a college of

Asia, and Phrygia; and this tells largely in favour of the view that the Christians of these provinces were also most numerous. Africa is the one country where I should conjecture that special circumstances led to a rapid increase of independent, *i.e.* of episcopal communities; but what those circumstances were, no one can tell.

[1] When Sozomen continues: ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ ἔθνεσιν ἐστὶν ὅπη καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀραβίοις καὶ Κυπρίοις ἔγνων καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐν Φρυγίαις Ναυατιανοῖς καὶ Μοντανισταῖς [cp. above, p. 101], one perceives that village bishops no longer existed in most of the provinces when he wrote (*c.* 430 A.D.). That they had been common at an earlier period is shown by the mere fact of their survival among the Phrygian adherents of Novatian and Montanus, since these sects held fast to ancient institutions.

presbyters, but by one or two presbyters. They are "country parishes" whose official "presbyters" have nothing in common with the members of the primitive college of presbyters except the name. Here I would again recall how Egypt forms the exception to the rule, inasmuch as large Christian churches throughout Egypt still continue to be governed by the collegiate system down to the middle of the third century. Nothing prevents us, in this connection, from supposing that these churches did hold tenaciously to the primitive form of ecclesiastical organization. Yet alongside of the presbyters in Egypt, even διδάσκαλοι would seem also to have had some share in the administration of the churches (Dionys. Alex., in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 24).

CHAPTER V.

COUNTER-MOVEMENTS.

1.

We have already discussed (vol. i. pp. 64 f.) the first systematic opposition offered to Christianity and its progress, viz., the Jewish counter-mission initiated from Jerusalem. This expired with the fall of Jerusalem, or rather, as it would seem, not earlier than the reign of Hadrian. Yet its influence continued to operate for long throughout the empire, in the shape of malicious charges levelled by the Jews against the Christians. The synagogues, together with individual Jews, carried on the struggle against Christianity by acts of hostility and by inciting hostility.[1]

[1] Cp. the martyrdom of Polycarp or of Pionius. In the *Martyr. Cononis* the magistrate says to the accused: *τί πλανᾶσθε, ἄνθρωπον θεὸν λέγοντες, καὶ τοῦτον βιοθανῆ; ὡς ἔμαθον παρὰ Ἰουδαίων ἀκριβῶς, καὶ τί τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅσα ἐνεδείξατο τῷ ἔθνει αὐτῶν καὶ πῶς ἀπέθανεν σταυρωθείς· προκομίσαντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπομνήματα [? ?] ἐπανέγνωσάν μοι* (von Gebhardt's *Acta Mart. Selecta*, p. 131): "Why do ye err, calling a man God, and that too a man who died a violent death? For so have I learnt accurately from the Jews, both as to his race and his manifestation to their nation and his death by crucifixion. They brought forward his memoirs and read them out to me." In his polemical treatise, Celsus makes a Jew come forward against the Christians—and this reflected the actual state of matters. Any pagans who wished to examine Christianity closely and critically, had first of all to learn from the Jews. On the other hand, as has

We cannot depict in detail the counter-movements on the part of the State, as these appear in its persecutions of the church.[1] All that need be done here is to bring out some of the leading points, with particular reference to the significance, both negative and positive, which the persecutions possessed for the Christian mission.

Once Christianity presented itself in the eyes of the law and the authorities as a religion distinct from that of Judaism, its character as a *religio illicita* was assured. No express decree was needed to make this plain. In fact, the "non licet" was rather the presupposition underlying all the imperial rescripts against Christianity. After the Neronic persecution, which was probably[2] instigated by the Jews (see above, vol. i. pp. 66), though it neither extended beyond Rome nor involved further consequences, Trajan enacted that provincial governors were to use their own discretion, repressing any given case,[3] but

been already shown (vol. i. pp. 76 f.), the Christians did not fail to condemn the Jews most severely. The instance narrated by Hippolytus (*Philos.*, ix. 12) *à propos* of the Roman Christian Callistus, is certainly remarkable, but none the less symptomatic. In order to secure a genuine martyrdom, Callistus posted himself on Sabbath at a synagogue and derided the Jews.

[1] See Neumann's *Der römische Staat und die allg. Kirche*, i. 1890; Mommsen, "der Religionsfrevel nach röm. Recht" (in the *Hist. Zeitschr.*, vol. lxiv. [N.S. vol. xxviii.], part 3, pp. 389–429; and Harnack on "Christenverfolgung" in the *Prot. Real. Encycl.* III.[3]

[2] Without this hypothesis it is scarcely possible, in my opinion, to understand the persecution.

[3] Trajan approves Pliny's procedure in executing Christians who, upon being charged before him, persistently refused to sacrifice. But he adds, "nothing can be laid down as a general principle, to serve as a fixed rule of procedure" ("in universum aliquid quod quasi certam formam habeat constitui non potest").

declining to ferret Christians out. Execution was their fate if, when suspected of *lèse-majesté* as well as of sacrilege, they stubbornly refused to sacrifice before the images of the gods of the emperor, thereby avowing themselves guilty of the former crime. *On the cultus of the Cæsars, and on this point alone, the State and the church came into collision.*[1] The apologists are really incorrect in asserting that the Name itself ("nomen ipsum") was visited with death. At least the statement only becomes correct with the corollary that this judicial principle was adopted simply because the authorities found that no true adherent of this sect would ever offer sacrifice.[2]

Down to the closing year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the imperial rescripts with which we are acquainted were designed, not to protect the Christians, but to safeguard the administration of justice and the police against the encroachments of an anti-Christian mob, as well as against the excesses of local councils who desired to evince their loyalty in a cheap fashion by taking measures against the Christians. Anonymous accusations had been already prohibited by Trajan. Hadrian had rejected the attempts of the Asiatic diet, by means of popular petitions, to move governors to severe measures against the Christians. Pius in a number of rescripts interdicted all "novelties" in procedure; beyond the

[1] Tert., *Apol.* x: "Sacrilegii et majestatis rei convenimur, summa haec causa, immo tota est" ("We are arraigned for sacrilege and treason; that is the head and front, nay, the sum total of our offence").

[2] Pliny (*ep.* xcvi. 5): "Quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt re vera Christiani" ("Things which no real Christian, it is said, can be made to do").

injunctions that Christians were not to be sought out ("quaerendi non sunt"), and that those who abjured their faith were to go scot-free, no step was to be taken. During this period, accusations preferred by private individuals came to be more and more restricted, both in criminal procedure as a whole, and in trials for treason. Even public opinion[1] was becoming more and more adverse to them. And all this told in favour of Christianity. Most governors or magistrates recognized that there was no occasion for them to interfere with Christians; convinced of their real harmlessness, they let them go their own way. Naturally, the higher any person stood in public life, the greater risk he ran of coming into collision with the authorities on the score of his Christian faith. Only on the lowest level of society, in fact, did this danger become at all equally grave, since life was not really of very much account to people of that class. People belonging to the middle classes, again, were left unmolested upon the whole; that is, unless any conspiracy succeeded in haling them before a magistrate. Down to the middle of the third century, this large middle class furnished but a very small number of martyrs. Soldiers, again, were promptly detected, whenever they made any use of their Christian faith in public.

Apart from the keen anti-Christian temper of a few proconsuls and the stricter surveillance of the city-prefects, this continued to be the prevailing attitude

[1] Tertullian does declare (*Apol.* ii.) that "every man is a soldier against traitors and public enemies" ("in reos majestatis et publicos hostes omnis homo miles est"), but he is referring to open criminals, not to suspected persons.

of the State down to the days of Decius, *i.e.* to the year 249. During this long interval, however, three attempts at a more stringent policy were made. "Attempts" is the only term we can use in this connection, for all three lost their effect comparatively soon. Marcus Aurelius impressed upon magistrates and governors the duty of looking more strictly after extravagances in religion, including those of Christianity. The results of this rescript appear in the persecution of 176–180 A.D.; but when Commodus came to the throne, the edict fell into abeyance. Then in 202 A.D., Septimius Severus forbade conversions to Christianity, which of course involved orders to keep a stricter watch on Christians in general. As the persecutions of the neophytes and catechumens in 202–203 attest, the rescript was not issued idly; yet before long it also was relaxed. Finally, Maximinus Thrax ordered the clergy to be executed, which implied the duty of hunting them out—in itself a fundamental innovation in the imperial policy. Outside Rome, however, it is improbable that this order was put into practice, save in a few provinces, although we do not know what were the obstacles to its enforcement. Down to the days of Maximinus Thrax the clergy do not appear to have attracted much more notice than the laity, and the edict of Maximinus did not strike many of them down. Still, there was significance in it. Plainly, the State had now become alive to the influential position occupied by the Christian clergy.

These attempts at severity were of brief duration. But the comparative favour shown to Christianity, upon the other hand, by Commodus, Alexander

Severus, and Philip the Arabian, led to a steady improvement in the prospects of Christianity with the passage of every decade, all the more so as the fanaticism of the mob and the repugnance shown by society towards Christians gradually declined after the opening of the third century.

Viewed externally, then, the persecutions up to the middle of the third century were not so grave as is commonly represented. Origen expressly states that the number of the martyrs during this period was small and easily counted. And a glance at Carthage and Northern Africa (as seen in the writings of Tertullian) bears out this observation. Up till 180 A.D. there were no local martyrs at all; up to the time of Tertullian's death there were hardly more than a couple of dozen, even when Numidia and Mauretania are included in the survey. And these were always people whom the authorities simply made an example of. Yet it would be a grave error to imagine that the position of Christians was quite tolerable. No doubt they were able, as a matter of fact, to settle down within the empire, but the sword of Damocles hung over each Christian's neck, and at any given moment every Christian was sorely tempted to deny his faith, since denial meant freedom from all molestation. The Christian apologists complained most of the latter evil, and their complaint was just. The premium set by the State upon denial of one's faith was proof positive, to their mind, that the administration of justice was controlled by demonic influence.

Despite the small number of martyrs, we may not therefore underrate the courage requisite for becoming a Christian and behaving as a Christian.

Especially are we bound to extol the staunch adherence of the martyrs to their principles. By the word or the deed of a moment, they might have secured exemption from their punishment, but they preferred death to a base immunity.

The illicit nature of Christianity unquestionably constituted a serious impediment to its propaganda, and it is difficult to say whether the attractiveness of all forbidden objects and the heroic bearing of the martyrs compensated for this drawback. It is an obstacle which the Christians themselves rarely mention, dwelling all the more upon the growth which accrued to them ever and anon from the martyrdoms. All over, indeed, history shows us that it is the "religio pressa" which invariably waxes strong and large, persecution being obviously an excellent means of promoting its expansion.

From the standpoint of morals, the position of living under a sword which fell but rarely, constituted a serious peril. Christians could go on feeling themselves a persecuted flock. Yet as a rule they were nothing of the kind. Theoretically they could credit themselves with all the virtues of heroism, and yet these were seldom put to the proof. They could represent themselves as raised above the world, and yet they were constantly bending before it. As the early Christian literature shows, this unhealthy state of matters led to undesirable consequences.[1]

[1] This does not even take into account the clandestine arrangements made with local authorities, or the intrigues and corruption that went on. From Tertullian's treatise *de fuga* we learn that Christian churches in Africa frequently paid monies to the local funds—*i.e.* of course, to the local authorities, to ensure that their members were left unmolested. The authorities themselves often advised

The development went on apace between 259 and 303. From the days when Gallienus ruled alone, Gallienus who restored to Christianity the very lands and churches which Valerian had confiscated, down to the nineteenth year of Diocletian, Christians enjoyed a halcyon immunity which was almost as good as a manifesto of toleration.[1] For Aurelian's attempt at coercion never got further than a beginning, nor did anyone follow it up; the emperor and his officials, like Diocletian subsequently, had other business to attend to. It was during this period that the great expansion of the Christian religion took place. For a considerable period Christians had held property and estates (in the name, I presume, of men of straw); now they could come before the public fearlessly,[2] as if they were a recognized body.[3]

Between 249 and 258, however, the two chief and severe persecutions of Christians took place, those under Decius and Valerian, while the last and fiercest

this. Cp. Tert., *Apol.* xxvii.: "Datis consilium, quo vobis abutamur" ("You advise us to take unfair advantage of you"); and *ad Scap.* iv.: "Cincius Severus [the proconsul] Thysdri ipse dedit remedium, quomodo responderent Christiani, ut dimitti possent" ("Cincius Severus himself pointed out the remedy at Thysdrus, showing how Christians should answer so as to get acquitted").

[1] From the fragments of Porphyry's polemical treatise, and indeed from his writings as a whole, we see how Christians were recognized (in contemporary society) as a familiar party which had no longer to fear any violence.

[2] We do not know under what title they came forward.

[3] Cp. the pagan (Porphyry) in Macar. Magnes., iv. 21: οἱ Χριστιανοὶ μιμούμενοι τὰς κατασκευὰς τῶν ναῶν μεγίστους οἴκους οἰκοδομοῦσιν, εἰς οὓς συνιόντες εὔχονται, καίτοι μηδενὸς κωλύοντος ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τοῦτο πράττειν, τοῦ κυρίου δηλονότι πανταχόθεν ἀκούοντος ("The Christians erect large buildings, in imitation of the temple-fabrics. In these they meet for prayer, although no one forbids them to do so in

began in February of 303. The former lasted only for a year, but this sufficed to spread fearful havoc among the churches. The number of the apostates was much larger, very much larger indeed, than the number of the martyrs. The rescript of Decius, a brutal stroke which was quite unworthy of any statesman, compelled at one blow all Christians, including even women and children, to return to their old religion or else forfeit their lives. Valerian's rescripts were the work of a statesman. They dealt merely with the clergy, people of good position, and members of the court; all other Christians were let alone, provided that they refrained from worship. Their lands and churches were, however, confiscated.[1] The tragic fate of both emperors ("mortes persecutorum!") put a stop to their persecutions. Both had essayed the extirpation of the Christian church, the one by the shortest possible means, the other by more

their own homes, while their Lord can plainly hear them anywhere"). So previously Cæcilius, *Minut.* ix.: "Per universum orbem sacraria ista taeterrima impiae coitionis adolescunt ("All over the world the utterly foul rites of that impious union are flourishing apace"). I have no doubt that Minucius belongs to the third century, and not to its opening period either.—The epithet of Χριστιανός occurs quite openly for the first time, so far as I am aware, in the year 279 upon a tomb in Asia Minor (see Cumont, *Les Inscr. chrét. de l'Asie mineure*, p. 11).

[1] The State never attacked the religion of private individuals. All it waged war upon was the refusal to perform the ceremonies of the cultus. Cp. the pregnant statement of the *Acta Cypriani*, i.: "Sacratissimi imperatores praeceperunt, eos qui Romanam religionem non colunt, debere Romanas caerimonias recognoscere" ("The most sacred Roman emperors enjoined that those who did not adhere to the Roman religion should recognize the Roman rites"). It was on principle therefore that Valerian and Diocletian attempted to crush down Christian worship.

indirect methods.[1] But in both cases the repair of the church was effected promptly and smartly, while the wide gaps in the membership were soon filled up again, once the rule was laid down that even apostates could be reinstated.

The most severe and prolonged of all the persecutions was the last, the so-called persecution under Diocletian. It lasted longest and raged most fiercely in the east and south-east throughout the domain of Maximinius Daza; it burned with equal fierceness, but for a shorter period, throughout the jurisdiction of Galerius; while over the domain of Maximianus and his successors its vigour was less marked, though it was still very grievous. Throughout the West its power was weak. It began with imperial rescripts, modelled upon the statesmanlike edict of Valerian, but even surpassing it in adroitness. Presently, however, these degenerated into quite a different form, which, although covered by the previous edicts of Decius, outdid them in pitiless ferocity throughout the East. Daza alone had recourse to preventive measures of a positive character. He had Acts of Pilate fabricated and circulated in all directions (especially throughout schools), which were drawn up in order to misrepresent Jesus;[2] on the strength of confessions extorted from Christians, he revived

[1] Obviously they saw that the procedure hitherto adopted was absurd, and that it had failed to harm the church. They rightly judged that Christians must be exterminated, if they were not to be let alone. "They must be sought out and punished" ("quaerendi et puniendi sunt").

[2] "Even the school teachers were to lecture on these zealously to their pupils, instead of upon the usual scholastic subjects; they were also to see that they were learnt by heart." "Children at

the old, abominable charges brought against them, and had these published far and wide in every city by the authorities (Eus., *H.E.*, i. 9; ix. 5. 7); he got a high official of the State to compose a polemical treatise against Christianity;[1] he invited cities to bring before him anti-Christian petitions;[2] finally—and this was the keenest stroke of all—he attempted the revival and reorganization of all the cults, headed of course by that of the Cæsars, upon the basis of the new classification of the provinces, in order to render them a stronger and more attractive counterpoise to Christianity.[3] "He ordered temples to be built in every city, and enacted the careful restoration of such as had collapsed through age; he also established idolatrous priests in all districts and towns, placing a high priest over them in every province, some official who had distinguished himself in every line of public service. He was also furnished with a military guard of honour."[4]

school repeated the names of Jesus and of Pilate every day, and also recited the Acts of Pilate, which were composed in order to deride us."

[1] The emperor himself is probably concealed behind Hierocles.

[2] The cities were subservient to this command; cp. the inscription of Arycanda and Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 7.

[3] He simply copied Julian in all these measures. The moving spirit of the whole policy was Theoteknus (Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 2 f.), for we cannot attribute it to an emperor who was himself a barbarian and given up to the most debased forms of excess.

[4] Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 14; see ix. 5: "Idolatrous priests were now appointed in every town, and Maximinus went on to appoint high priests himself. For the latter position he chose men of distinction in public life, who had gained high credit in all the offices they had filled. They showed great zeal, too, for the worship of those gods." Ever since the close of the second century the synodal organization of the church, with its metropolitans, had been moulded on the

The extent of the apostasy which immediately ensued is unknown, but it must have been extremely large. When Constantine conquered Maxentius, however, and when Daza succumbed before Constantine and Licinius, as did Licinius in the end before Constantine, the persecution was over.[1] During its closing years the churches had everywhere recovered from their initial panic-stricken terror; both inwardly and outwardly they had gained in strength. Thus when Constantine stretched out his royal hand, he found a church which was not prostrate and despondent but well-knit, with a priesthood which the persecution had only served to purify. He had not to raise the church from the dust, otherwise that politician would have hardly stirred a finger: on the contrary, the church confronted him, bleeding from many a wound, but unbent and vigorous. All the counteractive measures of the State had been proved to be of no avail; besides, of course, these were no longer supported by public opinion at the opening of the fourth century, as they had been during the second.

provincial diets of the empire—*i.e.* the latter formed the pattern of the former. But so much more thoroughly had it been worked out, that now, after the lapse of a century, the State attempted itself to copy this synodal organization with its priesthood so firmly centralized and so distinguished for moral character.

[1] Licinius was driven in the end to become a persecutor of the Christians, by his opposition to Constantine (cp. the conclusion of Eusebius's Church History and his *Vita Const.*, i. *ad fin.*, ii. *ad init.*). Among his laws, that bearing upon the management of prisons (to which allusion has been made already; cp. vol. i. p. 204) deserves notice (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, x. 8), as do the rescripts against the mutual intercourse of bishops, the holding of synods, the promiscuous attendance of men and women at worship, and the instruction of women by the bishops (*Vita Const.*, i. 51. 53).

Then the State had to curb the fanaticism of public feeling against the Christians; now few were to be found who countenanced hard measures taken by the State against the church. Thus Gallienus himself had, at his deathbed, to revoke the edicts of persecution, and his rescript, which was unkindly phrased (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 17), was ultimately replaced by Constantine's great and gracious decree of toleration (Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5; Lact., *de mort.* xlviii.).

2.

Several instances have been already given (in Book II., Chapters IV. and VI.) of the way in which Christians were thought of by Greek and Roman society and by the common people during the second century.[1] Opinions of a more friendly nature were not common. No doubt, remarks like these were to be heard: "Gaius Seius is a capital fellow. Only, he's a Christian!"—"I'm astonished that Lucius Titius, for all his knowledge, has suddenly turned Christian" (Tert., *Apol.* iii.).—"So-and-so thinks of matter and God just as we do, but he mingles Greek ideas with foreign fables" (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19). They were reproached with being inconceivably credulous, and absolutely devoid of judgment, whilst Christian doctrine and ethics, with their absurdities and pretensions, were deemed unworthy of any one who was free and cultured (so Porphyry especially). But this was the least of it. The majority, educated and

[1] A complete survey is given in my *Gesch. der. altchristl. Litt.*, i. pp. 865 f.

uneducated alike, were still more hostile in the second century. In the foreground of their calumnies stood the two charges of Œdipodean incest and Thyestean banquets, together with that of foreign, outlandish customs, and also of high treason. Moreover, there were clouds of other accusations in the air. Christians, it was reported, worshipped a god with an ass's head, and adored the cross, the sun, or the genitalia of their priests (Tert., *Apol.* xvi., and the parallels in Minutius).[1] It was firmly believed that they were magicians, that they had control over wind and weather, that they commanded plagues and famines, and had influence over the sacrifices.[2] Treatises against Christianity were not common in the second or even in the third century, but there may have been controversial debates. A Cynic philosopher named Crescens attacked Justin in public, though he seems to have done no more than echo the popular charge against Christianity. Fronto's attack moved almost entirely upon the same level, if it be the case that his arguments have been borrowed by the pagan Cæcilius in Minutius Felix. Lucian merely trifled with the question of Christianity. He was but a reckless, though an acute, journalist. The orator Aristides, again, wrote upon Christianity with ardent con-

[1] It is not difficult to trace the origin of these calumnies. The ass's head came, as Tertullian himself was aware, from the *Histories* of Tacitus, and referred originally to the Jews. They were doubtless worshippers of the sun, because they turned to the East in prayer. The third libel was of course based upon the attitude assumed at confession.

[2] Emphasis was often laid also upon the empty and terrible chimeras circulated by Christians (*Minut.* v.).

tempt,[1] while the treatise of Hierocles, which is no longer extant, is described by Eusebius as extremely trivial. Celsus and Porphyry alone remain, of Christianity's opponents.[2] Only two men; but they were a host in themselves.

[1] *Orat.* xlvi. He defends "the Greek nationality against the Christian and philosophic cosmopolitanism." To him Christians are despisers of Hellenism (cp. Bernays, *Ges. Abhandl.*, ii. p. 364). How a man like Tatian must have irritated him! Neumann (*der röm. Staat u. die allgem. Kirche*, p. 36) thus gives the charge of Aristides. "People, who themselves are simply of no account, venture to slander a Demosthenes, while solecisms at least, if nothing more, are to be found in every one of their own words. Despicable creatures themselves, they despise others; they pride themselves on their virtues, but never practise them; they preach self-control, and are lustful. Community of interests is their name for robbery, philosophy for ill-will, and poverty for an indifference to the good things of life. Moreover, they degrade themselves by their avarice. Impudence is dubbed freedom by them, malicious talk becomes openness forsooth, the acceptance of charity is humanity. Like the godless folk in Palestine, they combine servility with sauciness. They have severed themselves deliberately from the Greeks, or rather from all that is good in the world. Incapable of co-operating for any useful end whatsoever, they yet are masters of the art of undermining a household and setting its members by the ears. Not a word, not an idea, not a deed, of theirs has ever borne fruit. They take no part in organizing festivals, nor do they pay honour to the gods. They occupy no seats on civic councils, they never comfort the sad, they never reconcile those who are at variance, they do nothing for the advancement of the young, or indeed of anybody. They take no thought for style, but creep into a corner and talk stupidly. They are venturing already on the cream of Greece and calling themselves 'philosophers'! As if changing the name meant anything! As if that could of itself turn a Thersites into a Hyacinthus or a Narcissus!"

[2] Lactantius professes to know that "plurimi et multi" wrote in Greek and Latin against the Christians in Diocletian's reign (*Instit.*, v. 4), but even he adduces only one anonymous writer besides

They resembled one another in the seriousness with which they undertook their task, in the pains they lavished on it, in the loftiness of their designs, and in their literary skill. The great difference between them lies in their religious standpoint. Celsus's interest centres at bottom in the Roman empire. He is a religious man because the empire needs religion, and also because every educated man is responsible for its religion. It is hard to determine what his own conception of the world amounts to. But for all the hues it assumes, it is never coloured like that of Cicero or of Seneca. For Celsus is an agnostic above all things,[1] so that he appreciates the relative validity of idealism apart from any stiffening of Stoicism, just as he appreciates the relative validity

Hierocles. Occasionally a single *littérateur* who was hostile to Christianity, stirred up a local persecution, as, *e.g.*, was probably the case with Crescens the Cynic philosopher at Rome. Even before the edict of Decius a persecution had broken out in Alexandria, of which Dionysius (in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 41. 1) writes as follows: *οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ προστάγματος ὁ διωγμὸς παρ' ἡμῖν ἤρξατο, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὅλον ἐνιαυτὸν προῦλαβε, καὶ φθάσας ὁ κακῶν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ μάντις καὶ ποιητής, ὅστις ἐκεῖνος ἦν, ἐκίνησε καὶ παρώρμησε καθ' ἡμῶν τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς τὴν ἐπιχώριον αὐτοὺς δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀναρριπίσας* ("Our persecution did not begin with the imperial decree, but preceded that decree by a whole year. The prophet and framer of evil to this city, whoever he was, previously stirred up and aroused against us the pagan multitude, reviving in them the superstition of their country").

[1] The same sort of attitude is adopted by the pagan Cæcilius (in *Min. Felix*, v. f.), a sceptic who approves of religion in general, but who entertains grave doubts about a universal providence. "Amid all this uncertainty, your best and noblest course is to accept the teaching of your forebears, to honour the religious customs which have been handed down to you, and humbly to adore the deities whom your fathers taught you not to know but to fear, first and foremost." Chap. vii. then runs in quite a pious current.

of every national religion, and even of mythology itself. Porphyry, on the other hand, is a thinker, pure and simple, as well as a distinguished critic. And he is not merely a religious philosopher of the Platonic school, but a man of deeply religious temperament, for whom all thought tends to pass into the knowledge of God, and in that knowledge to gain its goal.

One's first impression is that Celsus has not a good word to say for Christianity. He re-occupies the position taken by its opponents in the second century; only, he is too fair and noble an adversary to repeat their abominable charges. To him Christianity, this bastard progeny of Judaism [1]—itself the basest of all national religions—appears to have been nothing but an absurd and sorry tragedy from its birth down to his own day. He is perfectly aware of the internal differences between Christians, and he is familiar with the various stages of development in the history of their religion. These are cleverly employed in order to heighten the impression of its instability. He plays off the sects against the Catholic church, the primitive age against the present, Christ against the apostles, the various revisions of the Bible against the trustworthiness of the text, and so forth, although, of course, he admits that everything was not really

[1] Like Porphyry and Julian at a later period, however, Celsus lets Judaism pass, because it was a national religion. *A propos* of an oracle of Apollo against the Christians, Porphyry observes: "In his quidem irremediabile sententiae Christianorum manifestavit Apollo, quoniam Judaei suscipiunt deum magis quam isti" ("In these verses Apollo exposed the incurable corruption of Christians, since it is the Jews, said he, more than the Christians, who recognize God"), Aug., *de civit. dei*, xix. 26.

so bad at first as it is at present. Nor is even Christ exempted from this criticism. What is valuable in his teaching was borrowed from the philosophers; the rest, *i.e.* whatever is characteristic of himself, is error and deception, so much futile mythology. In the hands of those deceived deceivers, the apostles, this was still further exaggerated; faith in the resurrection rests upon nothing better than the evidence of a deranged woman, and from that day to this the mad folly has gone on increasing, splitting itself up, prostituting itself, disgracing itself, yet ever asserting itself withal—for the assertion, which is flung out at one place, that it would speedily be swept out of existence, is retracted on a later page. Christianity, in short, is an anthropomorphic myth of the very worst type. Christian belief in providence is a shameless insult to the Deity—a chorus of frogs, forsooth, squatting in a bog and croaking, "For our sakes was the world created"!

But there is another side to all this. The criticism of Celsus does more than bring out some details of truth which deserve to be considered; wherever the critic bethinks himself of the Christian religion, he betrays throughout his volume an undercurrent which is far from being consonant with his fierce verdict. For although he shuts his eyes to it, apparently unwilling to admit that Christianity could be, and had even already come to be, stated reasonably, he cannot get round that fact; indeed—unless all appearances are deceptive—he has no intention whatever of concealing it from the penetrating reader. Since there is really to be such a thing as religion, since it is really a necessity, the agnosticism of Celsus

leads him to make a concession, which does not differ materially from the Christian conception of God. He cannot take objection to much in the ethical counsels of Jesus—his censure of them as a plagiarism being simply the result of perplexity. And when Christians assert that the Logos is the Son of God, what can Celsus do but express his own agreement with this dictum? Finally, the whole book culminates in a warm patriotic appeal to Christians, not to withdraw from the common *régime*, but to lend their aid, in order to enable the emperor to maintain the vigour of the empire with its ideal benefits. Law and piety must be upheld against their inward and external foes! Now in all this surely it is easy enough to read between the lines. Claim no special position for yourselves, says Celsus, in effect, to Christians! Don't rank yourselves on the same level as the empire! On these terms we are willing to tolerate you and your religion. At bottom, in fact, the "True Word" of Celsus is nothing more than a political pamphlet, a thinly disguised overture for peace.[1]

A hundred years later, when Porphyry wrote against the Christians, a great change had come over the situation. Christianity had become a power. It had taken a Greek shape, but "the foreign myths" were still retained, of course, while in the majority of cases at least it had preserved its sharp distinction between the creator and the creation, or between God and nature, as well as its doctrine of the incarnation

[1] Cæcilius, too, was in the last resort a politician and a patriot, as he defended the old religion by asserting that "by means of it Rome has won the world" (*Min. Felix* vi.).

and its paradoxical assertions of an end for the world and of the resurrection. This was where Porphyry came in, that great philosopher of the ancient world, himself a pupil of Plotinus and Longinus. For years he had been engaged in keen controversy at Rome with teachers of the church and gnostics, realizing to the full that the matter at stake was God himself and the supreme treasure possessed by mankind, viz., rational, religious truth. Porphyry knew nothing of political ideals. The empire had indeed ceased to fill many people with enthusiasm. Its restorer had not yet arrived upon the scene, and religious philosophy was living meanwhile in a state which it wished to begin and rebuild. Porphyry himself retired to Sicily, where he wrote his fifteen books "against the Christians." This work, which was "answered" by four leading teachers of the church (Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinarius, and Philostorgius), perished, together with his other polemical treatises, owing to the victory of the church and by order of the emperor. All that we possess is a number of fragments, of which the most numerous and important occur in Macarius Magnes. For I have no doubt whatever that Porphyry is the pagan philosopher in that author's "Apocriticus."[1]

This work of Porphyry is perhaps the most ample and thoroughgoing treatise which has ever been written against Christianity. It earned for its author the titles of *πάντων δυσμενέστατος καὶ πολεμώτατος* ("most malicious and hostile of all"), "hostis dei, veritatis inimicus, sceleratarum artium magister"

[1] At most we must leave it an open question whether a plagiarism has been perpetrated upon Porphyry.

(God's enemy, a foe to truth, a master of accursed arts), and so forth.[1] But, although our estimate can only be based on fragments, it is not too much to say that *the* controversy between the philosophy of religion and Christianity lies *to-day in the very position in which Porphyry placed it. Even at this time of day Porphyry remains unanswered. Really he is unanswerable, unless one is prepared first of all to agree with him and proceed accordingly to reduce Christianity to its quintessence.* In the majority of his positive statements he was correct, while in his negative criticism of what represented itself to be Christian doctrine, he was certainly as often right as wrong. Where he erred, was in his denials.

The weight which thus attaches to his work is due to the fact that it was based upon a series of most thoroughgoing studies of the Bible, and that it was undertaken from the religious standpoint. Moreover, it must be allowed that the author's aim was neither to be impressive nor to persuade or take the reader by surprise, but to give a serious and accurate refutation of Christianity. He wrought in the bitter sweat of his brow — this idealist, who was

[1] Augustine, however, called him "the noble philosopher, the great philosopher of the Gentiles, the most learned of philosophers, although the keenest foe to Christians" ("philosophus nobilis, magnus gentilium philosophus, doctissimus philosophorum, quamvis Christianorum acerrimus inimicus," *de civit. dei*, xix. 22). Compare the adjectives lavished on him by Jerome: "Fool, impious, blasphemer, mad, shameless, a sycophant, a calumniator of the church, a mad dog attacking Christ" ("Stultus, impius, blasphemus, vesanus, impudens, sycophantes, calumniator ecclesiae, rabidus adversus Christum canis").

convinced that whatever was refuted would collapse. Accordingly, he confined his attention to what he deemed the decisive points of the controversy. These four points were as follows:—He desired to demolish the myths of Christianity, *i.e.* to prove that, in so far as they were derived from the Old and New Testaments, they were historically untenable, since these sources were themselves turbid and full of contradictions. He did not reject the Bible *in toto* as a volume of lies. On the contrary, he valued a great deal of it as both true and divine. Nor did he identify the Christ of the gospels with the historical Christ.[1] For the latter he entertained a deep regard, which rose to the pitch of a religion. But with relentless powers of criticism he showed in scores of cases that if certain points in the gospels were held to be historical, they could not possibly be genuine, and that they blurred and distorted the figure of Christ. He dealt similarly with the ample materials which the church put to-

[1] It is only in a modified sense, therefore, that he can be described as an "opponent" of Christianity. As Wendland very truly puts it, in his *Christentum u. Hellenismus* (1902), p. 12, "The fine remarks of Porphyry in the third book of his περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας (pp. 180 f., Wolff), remarks to which theologians have not paid attention, show how from the side of Neoplatonism as well attempts were made to bring about a mutual understanding and reconciliation." "Praeter opinionem," says Porphyry (cp. August., *de civ. dei*, xix. 23), "profecto quibusdam videatur esse quod dicturi sumus. Christum enim dii piissimum pronuntiaverunt et immortalem factum et cum bona praedicatione eius meminerunt, Christianos vero pollutos et contaminatos et errore implicatos esse dicunt" ("What I am going to say may indeed appear extraordinary to some people. The gods have declared Christ to have been most pious; he has become immortal, and by them his memory is cherished. Whereas the Christians are a polluted set, contaminated and enmeshed in error"). Origen (*Cels.*, I. xv., IV. li.) tells how

gether from the Old Testament as "prophecies of Christ." But the most interesting part of his criticism is unquestionably that passed upon Paul. If there are any lingering doubts in the mind as to whether the apostle should be credited, in the last instance, to Jewish instead of to Hellenistic Christianity, these doubts may be laid to rest by a study of Porphyry. For this critic, a Hellenist of the first water, feels keener antipathy to Paul than to any other Christian. Paul's dialectic is totally unintelligible to him, and he therefore deems it both sophistical and deceitful. Paul's proofs resolve themselves for him into flat contradictions, whilst in the apostle's personal testimonies he sees merely an unstable, barbarian, and insincere rhetorician, who is a foe to all noble and liberal culture. It is from the hostile criticism of Porphyry that we learn for the first time what highly cultured Greeks found so obnoxious in the peculiar characteristics of Paul. In matters of detail he pointed out much that was really offensive;

Numenius, the Pythagorean philosopher, quoted the Jewish scriptures with deep respect, interpreting them allegorically (Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i. 22. 150, indeed ascribes to him the well-known saying that Plato is simply Moses Atticizing—*τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀττικίζων*; cp. also Hesych. Miles. in Müller's *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, iv. 171, and Suidas, s. v. "Νουμήνιος," with the more cautious remarks of Eusebius in his *Praep.*, xi. 9. 8–18. 25). Amelius the Platonist, a contemporary of Origen, quoted the gospel of John with respect (Eus., *Praep.*, xi. 19. 1); cp. Aug., *de civit. dei*, x. 29: "Initium evangelii secundum Johannem quidam Platonicus aureis litteris conscribendum et per omnes ecclesias in locis eminentissimis proponendum esse dicebat" ("A certain Platonist used to say that the opening of John's gospel should be inscribed in golden letters and set up in the most prominent places of every church"). Longinus (*περὶ ὕψους*) was acquainted with the Old Testament.

and although the offence in Paul almost always vanishes so soon as the critic adopts a different standpoint, Porphyry never lighted upon that standpoint.[1]

Negative criticism upon the historical character of the Christian religion, however, merely paved the way for Porphyry's full critical onset upon the other three doctrines of the faith which he regarded as its most heinous errors. The first of these was the Christian doctrine of creation, which separated the world from God, maintained its origin within time, and excluded any reverent, religious view of the universe as a whole. In rejecting this he also rejected the doctrine of the world's overthrow as alike irrational and irreligious—the one being involved in the other. He then directed his fire against the doctrine of the Incarnation, arguing that the Christians made a false separation (by their doctrine of a creation in time) and a false union (by their doctrine of the incarnation) between God and the world. Finally, there was the opposition he offered to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection.

On these points Porphyry was inexorable, warring against Christianity as against the worst of mankind's foes; *but in every other respect he was entirely at one with the Christian philosophy of religion, and was quite conscious of this unity.* And in his day the Christian philosophy of religion was no longer entirely inexorable on the points just mentioned; it made great efforts to tone down its positions for the benefit

[1] Longinus also had read the epistles of Paul, whom he describes as πρῶτον προιστάμενον δόγματος ἀναποδείκτου (*Fragm.* I., e, Cod. Vat. Urbin.).

of Neoplatonism, as well as to vindicate its scientific (and therefore its genuinely Hellenic) character.

How close the opposing forces already stood to one another! Indeed, towards the end of his life Porphyry seems to have laid greater emphasis upon the points which he held in common with the speculations of Christianity,[1] and the letter he addressed to his wife Marcella might almost have been written by a Christian.

In the work of Porphyry Hellenism wrote its testament with regard to Christianity—for Julian's polemical treatise partook more of a retrograde movement. The church managed to get the testament ignored and invalidated, but not until she had four times answered its contentions. It is an irreparable loss that these replies have not come down to us, though it is hardly a loss so far as their author is concerned.

[1] The magical, thaumaturgic element which Porphyry, for all his clear, scientific intellect, held in honour, was probably allowed to fall into the background while he attacked the Christians. But his Christian opponents took note of it. Here indeed was one point at which *they* were the more enlightened of the two parties, unless they had already been engulfed themselves in the cult of relics and bones. The characterisation of Porphyry which Augustine gives in the *de civit. dei* (x. 9) is admirable: "Nam et Porphyrius quandam quasi purgationem animae per theurgian, cunctanter tamen et pudibunda quodam modo disputatione, promittit, reversionem vero ad deum hanc artem praestare cuiquam negat, ut videas eum inter vitium sacrilegae curiositatis et philosophiae professionem sententiis alternantibus fluctuare" ("For even P. holds out the prospect of some kind of purgation of the soul, by aid of theurgy; though he does so with some hesitation and shame, denying that this art can secure for anyone a return to God. Thus you can detect his judgment vacillating between the profession of philosophy and an art which he feels to be both sacrilegious and presumptuous").

We have no information regarding the effect produced by the work, beyond what may be gathered from the horror displayed by the fathers of the church. Yet even a literary work of superior excellence could hardly have won the day. The religion of the church had become a world-religion by the time that Porphyry came to write, nor can any professor wage war successfully against such religions, unless his hand grasps the sword of the reformer as well as the author's pen.

The daily intercourse of Christians and pagans is not to be estimated, even in Tertullian's age, from the evidence supplied by episodes of persecution. It is unnecessary to read between the lines of his ascetic treatises, for numerous passages show, involuntarily but obviously, that as a rule everything went on smoothly in their mutual relationships. People lived together, bought and sold, entertained each other, and even intermarried. In later days it was certainly not easy to distinguish absolutely between a Christian and a non-Christian in daily life. Many a Christian belonged to "society" (see Book IV. Ch. II.), and the number of those who took umbrage at the faith steadily diminished. Origen had a position in the world of scholarship, where he enjoyed great repute. Paul of Samosata, who was a bishop, formed an influential and familiar figure in the city of Antioch. The leading citizens of Carthage were friends of Cyprian, according to the latter's biography (ch. xiv.), and even when he lay in prison they were true to him. "Meantime a large number of eminent people assembled, people, too, of high rank and good family

as well as of excellent position in this world. All of these, for the sake of their old friendship with Cyprian, advised him to beat a retreat. And to make their advice substantial, they further offered him places to which he might retire" ("Conveniebant interim plures egregii et clarissimi ordinis et sanguinis, sed et saeculi nobilitate generosi, qui propter amicitiam eius antiquam secessum subinde suaderent, et ne parum esset nuda suadela, etiam loca in quae secederet offerebant"). Yet all this cannot obscure the fact that, even at the opening of the fourth century, Christianity still found *the learning of the ancient world*, so far as that survived, in opposition to itself. One swallow does not make a summer. One Origen, for all his following, could not avail to change the real posture of affairs. Origen's Christianity was passed over as an idiosyncrasy; it commended itself to but a small section of contemporary scholars; and while people learned criticism, erudition, and philosophy from him, they shut their eyes to his religion. Nor were matters otherwise till the middle of the fourth century. Learning continued to be "pagan." It was the great theologians of Cappadocia and, to a more limited extent, those of Antioch (though the latter, judged by modern standards, were more scientific than the former), who were the first to inaugurate a change in this respect, albeit within well-defined limits. They were followed in this by Augustine. Throughout the East, ancient learning really never came to terms at all with Christianity, not even by the opening of the fifth century; but, on the other hand, it was too weak to be capable of maintaining itself side by side with the

church in her position of privilege, and consequently it perished by degrees. By the time that it died, however, Christianity had secured possession of a segment, which was by no means inconsiderable, of the circle of human learning.

Conclusion.

Hergenröther (*Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengesch.*, i. pp. 109 f.) has drawn up, with care and judgment, a note of twenty causes for the expansion of Christianity, together with as many causes which must have operated against it. The survey is not without value, but it does not clear up the problem. If the missionary preaching of Christianity in word and deed embraced all that we have attempted to state in Book II., and if it was allied to forces such as those which have come under our notice in Book III., then it is hardly possible to name the collective reasons for the success, or for the retardation, of the movement. Still less can one think of grading them, or of determining their relative importance one by one. Finally, one has always to recollect not only the variety of human aptitudes and needs and culture, but also the development which the missionary preaching of Christianity itself passed through, between the initial stage and the close of the third century.

Reflecting more closely upon this last-named consideration, one realizes that the question here has not been correctly put, and also that it does not admit of any simple, single answer whatsoever. At the opening of the mission we have Paul and some anonymous apostles. They preach the unity of God

and the near advent of judgment, bringing tidings to mankind of Jesus Christ, who had recently been crucified, the Son of God, the Judge, the Saviour. Almost every statement here seems paradoxical and upsetting. Towards the close of the epoch, there was probably hardly one regular missionary at work. The scene was occupied by a powerful church with an impressive cultus of its own, with priests, and with sacraments, embracing a system of doctrine and a philosophy of religion which were capable of competing on successful terms with any of their rivals. *This church exerted a missionary influence in virtue of her very existence, inasmuch as she came forward to represent the consummation of all previous movements in the history of religion. And to this church the human race round the basin of the Mediterranean belonged without exception, about the year 300, in so far as the religion, morals, and higher attainments of these nations were of any consequence.* The paradoxical, the staggering elements, in Christianity were still there. Only, they were set in a broad frame of what was familiar and desirable and "natural," clothed in a vesture of mysteries which made people either glad to welcome any strange, astonishing item in the religion, or at least able to put up with it.

Thus, in the first instance at any rate, our question must not run—"How did Christianity win over so many Greeks and Romans as to become ultimately the strongest religion in point of numbers?" The proper form of our query must be—"How did Christianity express itself, so as *inevitably* to become the religion for the world, tending more and more to displace other religions, and drawing men to itself as

to a magnet?" For an answer to this question we must look partly to the history of Christian dogma and of the Christian cultus. For the problem does not lie solely within the bounds of the history of Christian missions, and although we have kept it in view throughout the present work, it is impossible within these pages to treat it exhaustively.

One must first of all answer this question by getting some idea of *the particular shape* assumed by Christianity as a missionary force about the year 50, the year 100, the year 150, the year 200, the year 250, and the year 300 respectively, before we can think of raising the further question as to what forces may have been dominant in the Christian propaganda at any one of these six epochs. Neither must we overlook, of course, the difference between the state of matters in the East and in the West, as well as in several groups of provinces. And even were one to fulfil all these preliminary conditions, one could not proceed to refer to definite passages as authoritative for a solution of the problem. All over, one has to deal with considerations which are of a purely general character. I must leave it to others to exhibit these considerations—with the caveat that it is easy to disguise the inevitable uncertainties that meet us in this field by means of the pedantry which falls back on rubrical headings. The results of any survey will be trustworthy only in so far as they amount to such commonplaces as, *e.g.*, that the distinctively religious element was a stronger factor in the mission at the outset than at a later period, that a somewhat similar truth applies to the charitable and economic element in Christianity, that the conflict with polytheism

attracted some people and offended others, that the same may be said of the rigid morality, and so forth.

From the very outset Christianity came forward with a spirit of *universalism*, by dint of which it laid hold of *the entire life of man* in all its functions, throughout its heights and depths, in all its feelings, thoughts, and actions. This guaranteed its triumph. In and with its universalism, it also declared that the Jesus whom it preached was the *Logos*. To him it referred everything that could possibly be deemed of human value, and from him it carefully excluded whatever belonged to the purely natural sphere. From the very first it embraced humanity and the world, despite the small number of the elect whom it contemplated. Hence it was that those very powers of attraction, by means of which it was enabled at once to absorb and to subordinate the whole of Hellenism, had a new light thrown upon them. They appeared almost in the light of a necessary feature in that age. Sin and foulness it put far from itself. But otherwise it built itself up by the aid of any element whatsoever that was still capable of vitality. Such elements it crushed as rivals and conserved as materials of its own life. It could do so for one reason—a reason which no one voiced, and of which no one was conscious, yet which every truly pious member of the church expressed in his own life. The reason was, that Christianity, viewed in its essence, was something simple, something which could blend with coefficients of the most diverse nature, something which, in fact, sought out all such coefficients. For Christianity, in its simplest terms, meant God as the Father, the Judge, and the

Redeemer of men, revealed in and through Jesus Christ.

And was not victory the due of this religion? *Alongside of* other religions it could not hold its own for any length of time; still less could it succumb. Yes, victory was inevitable. It had to conquer. All the motives which operated in its extension are as nothing when taken one by one, in face of the propaganda which it exercised by means of its own development from Paul to Origen, a development which maintained withal a strictly exclusive attitude towards polytheism and idolatry of every kind.

BOOK IV

THE SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

CHAPTER I

GENERAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EXTENT AND INTENSITY OF THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY. THE MAIN STAGES IN THE HISTORY OF THE MISSION.

§ 1. Matt. xxiv. 14: *κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος*; cp. x. 18: *ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.*

§ 2. Paul, 1 Thess. i. 8: *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* [*οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαίᾳ*] *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν.*

Paul, Rom. i. 8: *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* (cp. xv. 19).

Paul, Coloss. i. 6: *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ παρὸν εἰς ὑμᾶς καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ* (cp. ver. 23: *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κηρυχθὲν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν*).

§ 3. [Paul] 1 Tim. iii. 16: [*Χριστὸς*] *ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ.*

§ 4. Acts xvii. 6: *οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες οὗτοι* [*i.e.* the Christian missionaries] *καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεισιν.*

§ 5. Acts xxi. 20: *θεωρεῖς, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τῶν πεπιστευκότων, καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσιν.*

§ 6. John's Apoc. vii. 9: *μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολύς ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο, ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν.*

§ 7. Mark xvi. 20: *ἐκεῖνοι* [*i.e.* the disciples of Jesus] *ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ*; cp. the variant appendix: *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἀχρὶ δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν* [*i.e.* the disciples] *τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα* (cp. Matt. xxiv. 9, xxviii. 19, Acts i. 8, and the Preaching of Peter cited in Clem., *Strom.*, vi. 6. 48).

§ 8. Clem. Rom. v: *Παῦλος . . . . δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον* ["Paul . . . . having taught righteousness to all the world."—Accordingly it is also said of Peter in the pseudo-Clementine epistle to James which introduces the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, that he "bore witness to all the world of the good King who was to come," *τὸν ἐσόμενον ἀγαθὸν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ μηνύσας βασίλεα*]; cp. xlii. 4: *οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . . κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες* ("the apostles preaching throughout countries and cities"), and lix. 2: *ὁ ἀριθμὸς . . . . τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* ("the number of the elect throughout all the world").

§ 9. Ignatius, *Eph.* iii.: *οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα* [*i.e.* *τοῦ κόσμου*] *ὁρισθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσίν* ("the bishops settled in the utmost corners of the world are in the mind of Jesus Christ").

§ 10. Pliny's *ep. ad Traj.*, xcvi. (xcvii.): " . . . . visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. neque civitates tantum

sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. certe satis constat prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti pastumque venire victimarum, cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur. ex quo facile est opinari, quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit paenitentiae locus" ("The matter seemed to me to deserve thought, especially as so many are imperilled. For many of all ages and ranks, and even of both sexes, are in risk of their lives, or will be. The infection of the superstition has spread not only through cities but into villages and country districts, and yet it seems possible to check it and put it right. At any rate it is quite certain that temples which were almost forsaken are beginning to be frequented; that sacred rites, long fallen into disuse, are being revived; and that there is a market for fodder used by the sacrificial victims, whereas up till now buyers had been very scarce. Hence it is easy to imagine what a multitude of men could be reclaimed, if they had but a chance of repentance"). Compare also Clem. Rom. vi., and Tacit., *Annal.*, xv. 44, where "a great multitude of the elect" (πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν, multitudo ingens) is said to have perished by martyrdom in the Neronic persecution. The expression "multitudo ingens" is used in Tertullian's *Apol.* xxi. of the number of adherents personally gained by Jesus. "Christians of the country," first used by Pliny, is a term which occurs pretty frequently in subsequent documents.

§ 11. Hermas, *Simil.*, viii. 3: τὸ δένδρον τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τὸ σκεπάζον πεδία καὶ ὄρη καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν νόμος θεοῦ ἐστὶν

ὁ δοθεὶς εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον· ὁ δὲ νόμος οὗτος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστὶ κηρυχθεὶς εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς, οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην λαοὶ ὄντες, οἱ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ κηρύγματος καὶ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν ("This mighty tree which overshadows plains, mountains, and all the earth, is God's law given to the whole world; and this law is the Son of God preached to the ends of the earth. The peoples under its shadow are those who have heard the preaching and believed on him"); cp. *Sim.*, ix. 17: τὰ ὄρη ταῦτα τὰ δώδεκα δώδεκα φυλαί εἰσιν αἱ κατοικοῦσαι ὅλον τὸν κόσμον· ἐκηρύχθη οὖν εἰς ταύτας ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων . . . . πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν κατοικοῦντα, ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκλήθησαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ("These twelve mountains are twelve tribes who inhabit the whole world; to these tribes, then, the Son of God was preached by the apostles. . . . All the nations dwelling under heaven are called by the name of the Son of God, once they hear and believe").

§ 12. Justin's *Apology* is inscribed thus: ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων ἀδίκως μισουμένων καὶ ἐπηρεαζομένων ("On behalf of those in every race who are unjustly hated and abused"); cp. xxv., xxvi., xxxii., xl., liii., and lvi., where Christians are invariably represented as derived "from all nations" (ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν) or "from every race of men" (ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων); also *Dial.* cxvii.: οὐδὲ ἓν γὰρ ὅλως ἔστι τι γένος ἀνθρώπων, εἴτε βαρβάρων εἴτε Ἑλλήνων εἴτε ἁπλῶς ᾧτινιοῦν ὀνόματι προσαγορευομένων, ἢ ἀμαξοβίων [= Scythians] ἢ ἀοίκων καλουμένων ἢ ἐν σκηναῖς κτηνοτρόφων οἰκούντων, ἐν οἷς διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ εὐχαὶ . . . . γίνωνται ("For there is not a single race of human beings, barbarians, Greeks, or whatever name you please to

call them, nomads or vagrants or herdsmen living in tents, where prayers in the name of Jesus the crucified are not offered up . . . .") ; cp. [xvii.], xliii., lii., liii., xci., cxxi., cxxxi., and *Apol.* I. liii. : πλείονας . . . . τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρέων Χριστιανοὺς εἰδότες ("more Christians from among pagans than from the Jews or Samaritans").

§ 13. Pseudo-Clem. (= bishop Soter), *ad Cor.* ii. : ἔρημος ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν, νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύσαντες πλείονες ἐγενόμεθα τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν θεόν ("Our people then seemed to be deserted by God ; whereas now, after believing, we have outnumbered those [*i.e.* the Jews] who seemed to have God").

§ 14. The anonymous author of the epistle to Diognetus, vi.: ἔσπαρται κατὰ πάντων τῶν τοῦ σώματος μελῶν ἡ ψυχή, καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ κόσμου πόλεις ("Through all the members of the body is the soul spread ; so are Christians throughout the cities of the world").

§ 15. Celsus (in *Orig.*, VIII. lxix.): ὑμῶν δὲ κἂν πλανᾶται τις ἔτι λανθάνων, ἀλλὰ ζητεῖται πρὸς θανάτου δίκην ("If any one of you transgresses secretly, he is none the less sought for and punished with death").

§ 16. Papylus (*Mart. Carpi, Papyli*, etc., xxxii. : = ἐν πάσῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ καὶ πόλει εἰσίν μοι τέκνα κατὰ θεόν ("In every province and city I have children towards God"). See also the remark of Melito to Marcus Aurelius (in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 26), that many imperial rescripts had been published in different cities regarding Christianity, and the fact that the rescript of Pius to the Common Diet of Asia, which contains a nucleus of truth, says that "many governors in the provinces have already addressed the emperor on the question of Christianity."

§ 17. *Iren.*, I. x. 2: τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρειληφυῖα καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα· καὶ ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παραδίδωσιν, ὡς ἓν στόμα κεκτημένη· καὶ γὰρ αἱ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον διάλεκτοι ἀνόμοιαι, ἀλλ' ἡ δύναμις τῆς παραδόσεως μία καὶ ἡ αὐτή· καὶ οὔτε αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἄλλως πεπιστεύκασιν ἢ ἄλλως παραδιδόασιν, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς Ἰβηρίαις οὔτε ἐν Κελτοῖς οὔτε κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς οὔτε ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οὔτε ἐν Λιβύῃ οὔτε αἱ κατὰ μέσα τοῦ κόσμου ἱδρυμέναι· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ὁ ἥλιος . . . . ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός, οὕτω καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας πανταχῇ φαίνει ("Though scattered throughout the whole world, the church carefully keeps this preaching and faith which she has received, as if she dwelt in a single house. Likewise she believes these doctrines as if possessed of a single soul and of one heart, proclaiming and teaching and handing them down with unbroken harmony, as if possessed of but one mouth. For although the languages of the world are varied, yet the meaning of the Christian tradition is one and the same. There is no whit of difference in what is believed or handed down by the churches planted in Germany or in Iberia or in Gaul or in the East or in Egypt or in Libya or in the central region of the world. Nay, as the sun remains the same all over the world . . . . so also the preaching of the faith shines everywhere"). See also III. ii. 8: κατέσπαρται ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς ("the church is scattered over all the earth"), ii. 31, 2: οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸν εἰπεῖν τῶν χαρισμάτων ὧν κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ θεοῦ λαβοῦσα, κ.τ.λ. ("It is impossible to enumerate the gifts received by the church from God over all the

world," etc,), and iii. 4. 1: "Quid autem si neque apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant ecclesias? cui ordinationi assentiunt multae gentes barbarorum eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charta vel atramento scriptam habentes per spiritum in cordibus salutem ("What if even the apostles had not left us writings? Would it not be necessary for us then to follow the course of that tradition which they bequeathed to those in whose care they left the churches?—a course adhered to by many nations among the barbarians who believe in Christ, having salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, without ink or paper").

§ 18. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vi. 18. 167: *ὁ τοῦ διδασκάλου τοῦ ἡμετέρου λόγος οὐκ ἔμεινεν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ μόνῃ, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἡ φιλοσοφία, ἐχύθη δὲ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πείθων Ἕλλήνων τε ὁμοῦ καὶ βαρβάρων κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ κώμην καὶ πόλιν πᾶσαν, οἴκους ὅλους καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστον τῶν ἐπακηκοότων, καὶ αὐτῶν γε τῶν φιλοσόφων οὐκ ὀλίγους ἤδη ἐπὶ ἀλήθειαν μεθιστάς* ("The word of our teacher did not remain in Judæa alone, as did philosophy in Greece, but was poured out over the whole universe, persuading Greeks and barbarians alike in the various nations and villages and cities, winning over whole households, and bringing to the truth each individual of those who had believed, as well as not a few philosophers").

§ 19. Polycrates (in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 24. 7) says of himself, that he had "met with Christian brethren from all over the world" (*συμβεβληκὼς τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀδελφοῖς.*)

§ 20. Tertullian, *Apol.* ii.: "Obsessam vociferantur

civitatem, in agris, in castellis, in insulis Christianos, omnem sexum, aetatem, condicionem, etiam dignitatem transgredi ad hoc nomen" ("The cry is that the State is infested with Christians, in the fields, in the villages, in the lodging-houses! Both sexes, every age and condition of life, rank itself, are gone over to the Christian name!"). xxxvii.: "Si et hostes exertos non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum et copiarum? plures nimirum Mauri et Marcomanni ipsique Parthi vel quantaecumque unius tamen loci et suorum finium gentes quam totius orbis? hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum, sola vobis relinquimus templa. cui bello non idonei, non prompti fuissemus, etiam impares copiis, qui tam libenter trucidamur, si non apud istam disciplinam magis occidi liceret quam occidere? potuimus et inermes nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abrupissemus a vobis, suffudisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcumque civium amissio, immo etiam et ipsa destitutione punisset. Procul dubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium verum et stuporem quendam quasi mortui orbis. . . . plures hostes quam cives vobis remansissent. nunc etiam pauciores hostes habetis prae multitudine Christianorum, paene omnium civitatium paene omnes cives Christianos habendo" ("If we wanted to play the part of avowed enemies, not merely of secret avengers, would we be lacking in numbers or resources? do the Mauri, the Marcomanni, the Parthians themselves, or

any nation, however great, belonging to one country and living within its own boundaries, do these, forsooth, outnumber one that is all over the world? We are but of yesterday. Yet we have filled all the places you frequent—cities, lodging-houses, villages, townships, markets, the camp itself, the tribes, town councils, the palace, the senate, and the forum. All we have left you is your temples. For what war should we not have been fit and ready, even despite our inferiority in numbers, we who are so willing to perish, were it not better, according to our mind, to be killed rather than to kill? We could have fought you even without being rebels, simply by showing our ill-will in separating from your polity. For if such a force of men as ours had broken away from you to some distant corner of the world, why, your empire would have been covered with shame at the loss of so many citizens, no matter who they were; nay, your punishment would have been civic bankruptcy. Undoubtedly you would have shuddered at your desolate condition, at the very silence, and at the stupor as of a world lying in death. . . . You would have been left with more foes than citizens; for nowadays it is owing to the multitude of Christians that your foes are fewer, since nearly all the citizens of nearly all your cities are Christians"). *Ad Scap.* ii.: "Tanta hominum multitudo, pars paene maior civitatis cuiusque, in silentio et modestia agimus" ("For all our vast numbers, constituting almost a majority in every city, we lead a quiet and modest life"). *Ad Scap.* v.: "Hoc si placuerit et hic fieri [*i.e.* bloody persecutions], quid facies de *tantis milibus hominum*, tot viris ac feminis, omnis sexus,

omnis aetatis, omnis dignitatis, offerentibus se tibi? quantis ignibus, quantis gladiis opus erit? quid ipsa Carthago passura est, decimanda a te, cum propinquos, cum contubernales suos illic unus quisque cognoverit, cum viderit illic fortasse et tui ordinis viros et matronas et principales quasque personas et amicorum tuorum vel propinquos vel amicos? parce ergo tibi, si non nobis; parce Carthagini, si non tibi; parce provinciae, quae visa intentione tua obnoxia facta est concussionibus et militum et inimicorum suorum cuiusque ("Should you determine to carry out this policy here, what will you do with so many thousands of people, men and women, of both sexes and of every age and rank, all presenting themselves to you? What fires, what swords you will require? What will Carthage herself have to suffer if thus you have to decimate her, since everyone will recognize in their number his relatives and companions, catching sight perhaps of men and women there who belong to your own rank, and recognizing all the principal men of the city, with kinsmen or friends of your own circle? Spare yourself, if you will not spare us! Spare Carthage, if you will not spare yourself! Spare the province, which the sight of your purpose has rendered liable to violent extortion at the hands of the soldiery and of one's private enemies"). *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 20: "Aspice universas nationes de voragine erroris humani exinde emergentes ad deum creatorem, ad deum Christum . . . . Christus totum iam orbem evangelii sui fide cepit" ("Look at whole nations emerging from the whirlpool of error, to God their creator, to Christ as God . . . . Christ has now won the whole round world by the faith of

his gospel"). *De fuga* xii.: "Numquam usque adhuc ex Christianis tale aliquid prospectum est sub aliqua redemptione capitis et sectae redigendis, cum tantae multitudinis nemini ignotae fructus ingens meti posset" ("Up to the present moment no such gain has ever been made out of any purchase-money paid for a Christian's person and sect, though a rich harvest could be reaped from their vast numbers, which are well known to everybody"). *Adv. Judæos* vii.: "In quem alium universae gentes crediderunt nisi in Christum, qui iam venit? [Then follows Acts ii. 9 f.] et ceterae gentes, ut iam Getulorum varietates, et Maurorum multi fines, Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversae nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita, et Sarmatarum, et Dacorum, et Germanorum, et Scytharum, et abditarum multarum gentium et provinciarum et insularum multarum nobis ignotarum, et quae enumerare minus possumus" ("On whom else have all the nations of the world believed, but on the Christ who has already come? . . . . with others as well, as different races of the Gaetuli, many tribes of the Mauri, all the confines of Spain, and various tribes of Gaul, with places in Britain which, though inaccessible to Rome, have yielded to Christ. Add the Sarmatæ, the Daci, the Germans, the Scythians, and many remote peoples, provinces, and islands unknown to us, which we are unable to go over").[1]

[1] See also Hippol., *Philos.*, x. 34: τοιοῦτος ὁ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀληθὴς λόγος, ὦ ἄνθρωποι Ἕλληνές τε καὶ βάρβαροι, Χαλδαῖοί τε καὶ Ἀσσύριοι, Αἰγύπτιοί τε καὶ Λιβυές, Ἰνδοί τε καὶ Αἰθίοπες, Κελτιό τε καὶ οἱ στρατηγοῦντες Λατῖνοι, πάντες τε οἱ τὴν Εὐρώπην, Ἀσίαν τε καὶ Λιβύην κατοι-

§ 21. Cæcilius, in *Minut. Felix* ix.: "Ac iam, ut fecundius nequiora proveniunt, serpentibus in dies perditis moribus per universum orbem sacraria ista taeterrima impiae coitionis adolescunt" ("And as the fouler a thing is, the faster it ripens, while dissolute morals glide on day by day all over the world, those loathsome rites of an impious assembly are maturing"); also Octavius in xxxi.: "Et quod in dies nostri numerus augetur, non est crimen erroris sed testimonium laudis" ("That our numbers increase daily is a reason, not for charging us with error, but for bearing witness to us with praise"); xxxiii.: "Nec nobis de nostra frequentia blandiamur: multi nobis videmur, sed deo admodum pauci sumus" ("Nor let us flatter ourselves about our numbers. We seem many to our own eyes, but in God's sight we are still few").

§ 22A. Origen, *in Matt. comment.*, series 39 (Lommatzsch, iv., pp. 209 f.) on Matt. xxiv. 9 ("et praedicabitur hoc evangelium regni in universo orbe, in testimonium omnibus gentibus, et tunc veniet finis): si discutere quis velit, quod ait 'omnibus gentibus,' satis inveniet certum, quoniam omnibus etiam in ultimis partibus terrae commorantibus gentibus odio habetur populus Christi, nisi forte et hic aliquis dicat propter exaggerationem positum 'omnibus' pro 'multis' . . . . et in hoc statu constitutis rebus (sc. in the last days) evangelium quod prius non fuerat praedicatum in toto

κοῦντες ("Such is the true word regarding God, O ye Greeks and barbarians, Chaldeans and Assyrians, Egyptians and Libyans, Indians and Ethiopians, Celts and warrior Latins, all ye inhabitants of Europe, Asia, and Libya").

mundo—multi enim non solum barbararum, sed etiam nostrarum gentium usque hunc non audierunt Christianitatis verbum—tunc autem praedicabitur, ut omnis gens evangelicam audiat praedicationem, et nemo derelinquatur qui non audivit, et tunc erit saeculi finis . . . . nondum enim multi proditores de ecclesia facti sunt, et nondum multi falsi prophetae exstiterunt multos fallentes: sic et nondum odio habiti sunt ab omnibus gentibus etiam in ultimis partibus terrae habitantibus, propter nomen Christi: sic et nondum est praedicatum evangelium regni in toto orbe. non enim fertur praedicatum esse evangelium apud omnes Ethiopas, maxime apud eos, qui sunt ultra flumen; sed nec apud Seras nec apud Ariacin" [Orientem, edd., but he probably means Ἀριακή, a region on the western coast of India] audierunt Christianitatis sermonem. quid autem dicamus de Britannis aut Germanis, qui sunt circa oceanum, vel apud barbaros, Dacos et Sarmatas et Scythas, quorum plurimi nondum audierunt evangelii verbum, audituri sunt autem in ipsa saeculi consummatione. adspice enim quod ait: 'et praedicabitur hoc evangelium regni in toto orbe, in testimonium omnibus gentibus, et tunc erit finis.' si autem vult quis temere dicere, praedicatum iam esse evangelium regni in toto orbe in testimonium omnibus gentibus, consequenter dicere poterit et quod ait 'tunc erit finis,' iam finem venisse: quod dicere temeritatis est magnae" ("And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the end come." "If anyone wishes to discuss the meaning of 'all nations' in this passage, he will find it quite clear and sure, since the

people of Christ are hated by all nations, even by those dwelling in the uttermost parts of the earth. Unless, it may be, one declares that here too 'all' is put for 'many' by way of hyperbole. . . . Such being the position of affairs [*i.e.* at the end], the gospel, which formerly had not been preached in all the world—for many people, not only barbarians but even of our empire, have not yet heard the word of Christ—this gospel will then be proclaimed, so that every race may hear the evangel, leaving none who fails to hear it. And thereafter the end will come. . . . For many traitors have not yet arisen from the church. Many false prophets have not yet arisen to deceive many. Nor yet have all the nations dwelling in the uttermost parts of the earth hated us for the sake of Christ's name; nor yet has the gospel of the kingdom been preached in all the world. For we are not told that the gospel has been preached among all the Ethiopians, particularly among those who are on the other side of the River; nor among the Seræ, nor in Ariace, has the tale of Christ been heard. But what shall we say of Britain or Germany, on the seaboard, or the barbarians, the Dacians, the Sarmatæ, and the Scythians, most of whom have not yet heard the gospel, but are to hear it at the consummation of the ages? For see what he saith. 'And this gospel shall be preached in all the world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the end be.' If anyone would hastily affirm that the gospel of the kingdom had been already preached in all the world as a testimony to all nations, he would also be able to say, of course, 'then shall the end be,' the end is now here. Which would be an exceedingly rash asser-

tion"). Orig., *c. Cels.*, III. xv.: *ἐπὰν πάλιν οἱ παντὶ τρόπῳ διαβάλλοντες τὸν λόγον τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο νῦν στάσεως ἐν πλήθει τῶν πιστευόντων νομίσωσιν εἶναι, ἐν τῷ μὴ προσπολεμεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων ὁμοίως τοῖς πάλαι χρόνοις* ("Since those who utter all kinds of calumny against the gospel ascribe the present prevalence of sedition to the multitude of believers, and to the latter not being persecuted by the authorities, as long ago they were"); *ibid.*, III. xxix.: *ὁ δὲ πέμψας τὸν Ἰησοῦν θεὸς ἐκλύσας πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπιβουλὴν ἐποιήσε πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστροφῆς καὶ διορθώσεως κρατῆσαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ καὶ γενέσθαι πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἀντιπολιτευομένας ἐκκλησίας δεισιδαιμόνων καὶ ἀκολάστων καὶ ἀδίκων* [see vol. i. p. 334]. In III. xxx. we read that the presbyters of the Christian churches were worthy of holding civic offices of authority, *εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παντὶ πόλις τοῦ θεοῦ* ("if there be any such city of God in all the world"); VIII. lxix.: *φαμὲν ὅτι, εἴπερ, "ἂν δύο συμφωνῶσιν ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περὶ παντὸς πράγματος οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται γενήσεται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πατρός"—τί χρὴ νομίζειν, εἰ μὴ μόνον ὡς νῦν πάνυ ὀλίγοι συμφωνοῖεν ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή*; ("We say that 'if two of us agree on earth as touching anything that they ask, it shall be done for them by the Father in heaven'; and what if not simply a handful of people agree, as at present, but the whole Roman empire?"). VIII. lxviii.: *πᾶσα μὲν θρησκεία καταλυθήσεται, μόνη δὲ ἡ Χριστιανῶν κρατήσει, ἥτις καὶ μόνη ποτὲ κρατήσει, τοῦ λόγου ἀεὶ πλείονας νεμομένου ψυχάς* [cp. vol. i. p. 332]. III. viii.: *ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα εὐαρίθμητοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθνήκασι, κωλύοντος θεοῦ τὸ πᾶν ἐκπολεμηθῆναι αὐτῶν ἔθνος* ("From time to time a few, who can easily be counted,

died for the sake of the Christian religion, God refusing to allow the whole people to be exterminated"). III. x.: *ὅτι μὲν οὖν συγκρίσει τοῦ ἐξῆς πλήθους ὀλίγοι ἦσαν ἀρχόμενοι Χριστιανοὶ δῆλον* (in reply to Celsus, who had declared that the original number of Christians was extremely small, Origen observes: "It is patent that Christians at first were few in number, compared to their subsequent host"). III. ix.: *νῦν μὲν οὖν τάχα, ὅτε διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν προσερχομένων τῷ λόγῳ καὶ πλούσιοι καί τινες τῶν ἐν ἀξιώμασι καὶ γύναια τά ἄβρα καὶ εὐγενῆ ἀποδέχονται τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου, τολμήσει τις λέγειν διὰ τό δοξάριον προϊαστασθαί τινας τῆς κατὰ Χριστιανοὺς διδασκαλίας* [cp. vol. i. p. 436]. In *In Joh.*, tom. i. 1, we read that "it is not too bold an assertion to say that the number of Jewish Christians does not amount to 144,000"; *c. Cels.*, I. lvii.: "The number of disciples belonging to Simon Magus all over the world does not amount at present, in my opinion, to thirty. Perhaps that is even putting it too high. They only exist in Palestine, and indeed only in extremely small numbers." For a passage from Origen, quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii. 1), see under § 27.

§ 22B. The pagan (Porphyry) in Macarius Magnes, iv. 3: *ἰδοῦ πᾶσα τῆς οἰκουμένης ῥύμη τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν πεῖραν ἔχει καὶ τέρμονες ὅλοι καὶ κόσμου πέρατα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὅλον κατέχουσι* ("Behold, every corner of the universe has experienced the gospel, and the whole ends and bounds of the world are occupied with the gospel").

§ 23. Lucian the Martyr, *Orat.* (in Rufin, *H.E.*, ix. 6): "Quae autem dico, non sunt in obscuro gesta loco nec testibus indigent. pars paene mundi iam maior huic veritati adstipulatur, urbes integrae, aut si in his aliquid suspectum videtur, contestatur de

his etiam agrestis manus, ignara figmenti" ("But the matters I refer to did not take place in some hidden spot, nor do they lack witnesses. Almost the greater part of the world is now devoted to this truth, whole cities in fact, and if any of these be suspect, there are also multitudes of country folk, who are innocent of guile").

§ 24. Maximinus Daza's Rescript to Sabinus (in Euseb., *H.E.*, ix. 9): *ἡνίκα συνεῖδον σχεδὸν ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους καταλειφθείσης τῆς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἑαυτοὺς συμμεμιχότας* (Diocletian and Maximian issued edicts for the suppression of Christianity, "when they saw almost all men deserting the worship of the gods and attaching themselves to the Christian people").

§ 25. Lactantius, *de mort. persec.* 2: "Et inde discipuli qui tunc erant undecim . . . . dispersi sunt per omnem terram ad evangelium praedicandum . . . . et per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias et civitates ecclesiae fundamenta miserunt. . . ." "Nero cum animaadverteret non modo Romae sed ubique cotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum et ad religionem novam transire" ("Thence the disciples, who then numbered eleven, scattered over all the earth to preach the gospel . . . . and for twenty-five years, down to the beginning of Nero's reign, laid the foundation of the church in every province and state." "When Nero noticed that not only at Rome but everywhere a large multitude were daily falling away from idolatry and coming over to the new religion"). 3 (between Trajan and Decius): "Ut iam nullus esset terrarum angulus tam remotus quo non

religio dei penetrasset, nulla denique natio tam feris moribus vivens, ut non suscepto dei cultu ad iustitiae opera mitesceret" ("There was now no nook or corner of the earth so remote that the divine religion had not reached it, no nation so rough in life that it was not mellowing to works of righteousness by having accepted the worship of God"). Cp. Arnobius, ii. 5: "Iam per omnes terras in tam brevi temporis spatio inmensi nominis huius sacramenta diffusa sunt. nulla iam natio est tam barbari moris et mansuetudinem nesciens, quae non eius amore versa molliverit asperitatem suam et in placidos sensus adsumpta tranquillitate migraverit" ("The sacraments of this great name are now spread all over the earth in so short a time. No nation now is so barbarous and ignorant of mercy, that it has not been turned by this love to modify its harsh ways, and come over to a peaceful temper by the acceptance of peace").

§ 26. Constantine's Rescript to Miltiades (Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5) speaks as if the entire population of North Africa were divided between the Catholics and the Donatists.

§ 27. Eusebius[1] (*H.E.*, i. 3. 12): Christ has filled the whole world with his holy name. i. 3. 19: *μόνον αὐτὸν ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν πώποτε εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις καθ' ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου Χριστὸν ἐπιφημίζεσθαι ὁμολογεῖσθαί τε καὶ μαρτυρεῖσθαι πρὸς ἁπάντων ἐπὶ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ παρά τε Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις μνημονεύεσθαι, καὶ εἰς ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς ἀνὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην αὐτοῦ θιασώταις*

[1] We need not do more than set down the most characteristic passages out of the large number of relevant sections in the Church History. And even these are only given sometimes in as abbreviated a form as possible.

τιμᾶσθαι μὲν ὡς βασιλέα, θαυμάζεσθαι δὲ ὑπὲρ προφήτην, κ.τ.λ. ("He alone of all who ever lived is still called by the name of Christ among all men over the whole world; yea, confessed and witnessed to under this title, and commemorated by Greeks and barbarians, and even to this day he is honoured as a king by his followers throughout all the world, admired as Something greater than a prophet," etc.). i. 4. 2: τῆς μὲν γὰρ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας νεωστὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιλαμψάσης, νέον ὁμολογουμένως ἔθνος, οὐ μικρὸν οὐδ' ἀσθενὲς οὐδ' ἐπὶ γωνίας που γῆς ἱδρυμένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυανθρωπότατόν τε καὶ θεοσεβέστατον . . . . τὸ παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προηγορίᾳ τετιμημένον [cp. vol. i. p. 314]. i. 13. 1: "Even in Christ's lifetime he was visited by myriads (μύριοι ὅσοι) from the remotest lands imploring aid." ii. 2. 1: The resurrection and ascension of Jesus were forthwith known to most people (παρὰ πλείστοις). ii. 4. 2: (in the apostolic age) καὶ δὴ ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις τε καὶ κώμας, πληθυούσης ἄλωνος δίκην, μυρίανδροι καὶ παμπληθεῖς ἀθρόως ἐκκλησίαι συνεστήκεσαν ("In all the cities and villages churches were speedily set up and thronged, like a well-heaped threshing-floor, with multitudes of people"). ii. 13. 1: τῆς εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα . . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἤδη διαδιδομένης πίστεως ὁ τῆς ἀνθρώπων πολέμιος σωτηρίας τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν προαρπασασθαι μηχανώμενος ἐνταῦθα Σιμῶνα [Magus] ἄγει ("Faith in Jesus Christ the Saviour having now been spread abroad among all men, the enemy of man's salvation, plotting to secure the imperial city for himself, brought Simon thither"); but Simon's sect was soon vanquished, nor did it survive the apostolic age (τοὺς ἀποστολικοὺς χρόνους, ii. 14. 3), for the Logos

prevailed, "having lately shone upon men from God and now waxing strong on earth" (ὁ ἄρτι θεόθεν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιλάμψας, αὐτός τε ἐπὶ γῆς ἀκμάζων). iii. 1. 1 f. [after Origen's *Exeg. in Gen.*, tom. iii.]: τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τε καὶ μαθητῶν ἐφ' ἅπασαν κατασπαρέντων τὴν οἰκουμένην, Θωμᾶς μέν, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις περιέχει, τὴν Παρθίαν εἴληχεν, Ἀνδρέας δὲ τὴν Σκυθίαν, Ἰωάννης τὴν Ἀσίαν ("The holy apostles and disciples of our Saviour were scattered abroad over all the world, Parthia, as tradition has it, being assigned to Thomas, Scythia to Andrew, Asia to John"); then follow remarks upon the missionary spheres of Peter and Paul, based on the New Testament; cp. also iii. 5. 2, where the original apostles start from Jerusalem for all the nations (εἰς σύμπαντα τὰ ἔθνη), to the ends of the earth (εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης, iii. 8. 11), or to all the world (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, iii. 24. 3). iii. 18. 4 f.: [in Domitian's reign] ἡ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως διέλαμπε διδασκαλία, ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἄποθεν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου συγγραφεῖς μὴ ἀποκνῆσαι ταῖς αὐτῶν ἱστορίαις τόν τε διωγμὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτύρια παραδοῦναι ("The teaching of our faith so throve then, that even writers who were far from our religion did not hesitate to mention in their histories this persecution and its martyrdoms," *e.g.*, of Domitilla). iii. 37. 1 f.: the evangelists who succeeded the apostles "built up the foundations of the churches which had been laid in all quarters by the apostles" (τοὺς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προκαταβληθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων θεμελίους ἐπῳκοδόμουν), preaching the gospel "to those who had not yet heard the word of faith" (τοῖς ἔτι πάμπαν ἀνηκόοις τοῦ τῆς πίστεως λόγου). iv. 2. 1: [in Trajan's reign] τὰ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας τε καὶ ἐκκλησίας ὁσήμεραι

ἀνθοῦντα ἐπὶ μεῖζον ἐχώρει προκοπῆς ("The affairs of our Saviour's teaching and church flourished daily and made steady advances"). iv 7. 1: [in Hadrian's reign] ἤδη λαμπροτάτων δίκην φωστήρων τῶν ἀνὰ τέν οἰκουμένην ἀποστιλβουσῶν ἐκκλησιῶμ ἀκμαζούσης τε εἰς ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος τῆς εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. πίστεως, κ.τ.λ. ("The churches shining throughout the world were now like the most brilliant constellations, and faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was flourishing among all the human race"; cp. 13). v. 21. 1: κατὰ τὸν τῆς Κομόδου βασιλείας χρόνον μετεβέβλητο μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ πρᾶον τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, εἰρήνης σὺν θείᾳ χάριτι τὰς καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης διαλαβούσης ἐκκλησίας, ὅτε καὶ ὁ σωτήριος λόγος ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων πᾶσαν ὑπήγετο ψυχὴν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐσεβῆ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων θεοῦ θρησκείαν, ὥστε ἤδη καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὖ μάλα πλούτῳ καὶ γένει διαφανῶν πλείους ἐπὶ τὴν σφῶν ὁμόσε χωρεῖν πανοικί τε καὶ παγγενῆ σωτηρίαν ("About the time of the reign of Commodus our affairs changed for the better, and by God's grace the churches all over the world enjoyed peace. Meanwhile the word of salvation was conducting every soul from every race of man to the devout worship of the God of all things, so that a large number of people at Rome, eminent for great wealth and high birth, turned to their salvation along with all their households and families"). v. 23. 1: τῆς Ἀσίας ἁπάσης αἱ παροικίαι . . . . αἱ ἀνὰ τὴν λοιπὴν ἅπασαν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαι ("The parishes of all Asia . . . . the churches all over the rest of the world"). vi. 36. 1: [in the reign of Philip the Arabian] τότε δῆτα, οἷα καὶ εἰκὸς ἦν, πληθυούσης τῆς πίστεως, πεπαρρησιασμένου τε τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς παρὰ πᾶσι λόγου, κ.τ.λ. ("Then indeed, as was only fitting, when the faith was increasing, and our doctrine being

confidently proclaimed to all men," etc.). vii. 10. 3: *πᾶς τε ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ θεοσεβῶν πεπλήρωτο καὶ ἦν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ* (before Valerian turned persecutor, he had been more friendly to the church than any previous emperor, "and his whole house had been filled with pious persons, being a very church of God"). viii. 1. 1 f.: *ὅσης μὲν καὶ ὁποίας πρὸ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ* [the Diocletian persecution] *δόξης ὁμοῦ καὶ παρρησίας ὁ . . . . τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις ἠξίωτο, μεῖζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπαξίως διηγήσασθαι . . . . πῶς δ' ἄν τις διαγράψειε τὰς μυριάνδρους ἐκείνας ἐπισυναγωγὰς καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἀθροισμάτων, τάς τε ἐπισήμους ἐν τοῖς προσευκτηρίοις συνδρομάς; ὧν δὴ ἕνεκα μηδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς πάλαι οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας*; ("It is beyond our power to describe in any adequate fashion the scope and character of the glory and open freedom with which, previous to this persecution of ours, the . . . . word of piety was honoured among all men, Greeks and barbarians alike. . . . How can any one depict those vast gatherings of people, the crowds that assembled in every city, and the famous convocations held in the places of prayer? So great were these, that, dissatisfied with the old buildings, the people now proceeded to erect churches from the foundation upwards in all the cities"). viii. 14. 1: Maxentius started as though he would profess our faith, "in order to please and flatter the people of Rome" (*ἐπ' ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων*). i. 4. 2 (see above): the Christians are now the most populous nation in the world.[1]—

[1] In conclusion, we may set down this further passage from Firmic. Matern. *de err. prof. relig.* xx., although it was written about

Theophan., v. 26: "(The disciples) should teach His commandments both in the villages and cities, some of them to the Roman power (itself), and so apportion to themselves this city of the empire, others also to the Persians, others to those among the Armenians, others to the nation of the Parthians, and again to that also of Scythians, (that) some of these should go forth, even as far as the extremities of the creation, and arrive at the country of the Hindoos, others pass over to the Islands beyond the ocean, and which are called Britain" (cp. *Demonstr. evang.*, p. 112 c).—*Op. cit.*, v. 49 (on the apostles): "Nevertheless, when again I view its power and the result of its doings, how the many myriads have given their assent to it, and *how churches of tens of thousands of men* have been brought together by these very deficient and rustic persons—nor that these were built in obscure places, nor in those which are unknown, but rather in the greatest cities, I say in the Imperial city of Rome itself, in Alexandria, in Antioch, in all Egypt, in Libya, in Europe, in Asia, both in the villages and (other) places and among all nations—I am again compelled to recur to the question of its cause, and to

twenty years after the council of Nicæa: "Quis locus in terra est, quem non Christi possederit nomen? qua sol oritur, qua occidit, qua erigitur septemtrion, qua vergit auster, totum venerandi numinis maiestas implevit, et licet adhuc in quibusdam regionibus idololatriae morientia palpitent membra, tamen in eo res est ut a Christianis omnibus terris pestiferum hoc malum funditus amputetur" ("What spot is there upon earth, which is not held by the name of Christ? Where the sun rises and sets, in every quarter of the globe, the glory of his honourable heavenly majesty has filled creation. And although the dying limbs of idolatry still quiver in some countries, this deadly evil is to be cut off by Christians in every land").

confess that they could not otherwise have undertaken this enterprise, than by a Divine power which exceeds that of man and by the assistance of Him who said to them: Go and make disciples of all nations in my name."

The passages printed in the collection of evidence are not of equal value, and a brief commentary may serve to elucidate their bearing.

Once the mission to the Gentiles had become a fact, thanks to Paul and some others (but against the primitive aim as expressed in Matt. x. 5 f.), "the whole world" must have been forthwith regarded as a sphere for Christian missions. Once the circle had been extended beyond Israel, no limit could be set to its sweep. To complete the circle with all speed was a duty which was urgently pressed home to Christians by their firm hope in the near advent of Christ and the approaching end of all things. For if the first appearance of Christ was a matter of moment to all mankind as well as to Israel, then all nations must hear of this appearance; while, if the end was imminent, the work of the Christian mission must be completed very soon. Ere long, the amount of work which had really been accomplished got obscured under a fantastic belief (fomented by the Christian expectation of the future), to the effect that the preaching of the gospel had already permeated all the world.[1] What was a deliberate

[1] Are we not to understand the original form of the story of Pentecost (in Acts ii.) in some such sense?—as though the end might come, now that representatives from all the nations were gathered in Jerusalem, and had thus had the gospel brought home to them all.

rhetorical exaggeration, to begin with, became transmuted into a firm conviction. And this became in turn the nucleus of legends relating to the mission, legends whose origin lies in the soil to which we have just alluded, and whose development, lasting as late as the sixteenth century, resulted in every country upon earth being gradually allotted a mission-history which commenced with the apostles. Throughout the West the headquarters of this mission were held to have been Rome, ever since it became a matter of vital moment to show that Peter was the only apostle who reached the West. But to write the history of such missionary legends would require a whole volume to itself.

The testimonies collected under §§ 1–4, 6–9, and 11, represent the original and ancient conception of the early spread of the gospel over all the world. They tell us nothing whatever about the actual spread, though they certainly bear witness to its energetic character.

§ 1 (Matt. xxiv. 14) contains the general theory of the mission, which is put into the life of Jesus: "the gospel has to be preached to all the world for a testimony to the heathen. Then comes the end." The eschatological picture drawn by the author of the Apocalypse (§ 6, Apoc. vii. 9) corresponds to this.

§ 2. The passages from Paul (1 Thess. i. 8, Rom. i. 8, Col. i. 6, 23) are deliberate rhetorical exaggerations; so in § 4 (Acts xviii. 6).

The passages in § 7 (Matt. xxiv. 9, Mark xvi. 8, Acts i. 8; Preaching of Peter) and § 3 (1 Tim. iii. 16, quotation from a hymn), affirm that the disciples of

Jesus, or the apostles, received a commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to all men, and that *they discharged this commission.* This belief, that the original apostles had already preached the gospel to the whole world, is therefore extremely old; nor, even supposing that Matt. xxviii. 19 is taken as an interpolation, need it be put later than *c.* 90 A.D. (cp. Acts i. 8). Both Clemens Romanus (§ 8) and Ignatius (§ 9) assume that the gospel has already been diffused all over the world, the former speaking, with rhetorical exaggeration, of Paul as the missionary who had taught all the world. Finally, as the conception emerges in Hermas (§ 11), it is exceptionally clear and definite; and this evidence of Hermas is all the more weighty, as he may invariably be taken to represent opinions which were widely spread and commonly received. On earth, as he puts it, there are twelve great peoples, and the gospel has already been preached to them all by the apostles.[1]

The actual expansion of the gospel during the first century must be deduced from the writings of the New Testament and the earliest extra-canonical literature. With regard to the intensity of its spread, we possess no evidence beyond that of the passages cited under § 5 (Acts xxi. 20) and § 10 (Pliny). These passages, however, are of extreme importance. The former testifies that among the

[1] I shall not enter into any discussion of the legends underlying the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, since it is no longer possible to ascertain accurately even the modicum of truth which may perhaps serve as their historical kernel. But a few details will be discussed elsewhere. The legends regarding the distribution of the apostles and their missionary spheres are set forth by Lipsius in his *Apokr. Apostelgeschichten,* i. 1, pp. 11 f.

Palestinian Jews, at the time of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem (*i.e.* during the sixth decade),[1] Christians were already to be found in tens of thousands. And the latter passage yields even richer spoil. It sketches the compass and consequences of the Christian propaganda in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan, depicting an activity which astounds us and which might dispose us to question Pliny's statements —particularly as he had good reasons for exaggerating the movement,[2] in order to dissuade the emperor from taking any wholesale, bloody measures for its repression. Still, the main points of the governor's tale must be correct, and they are quite enough to justify the opinion that exceptionally strong tendencies were abroad in these provinces which operated in favour of a religion like Christianity (see below, Sect. III. § 9 in the third chapter of this Book).

As the statements of Justin (§ 12) and the author of the epistle to Diognetus (§ 14) upon the diffusion of Christianity are products mainly of the theoretical belief that the gospel must have already spread all over the earth, they are of no value,[3] although the evidence of *Dial.* cxvii. may perhaps be based on some knowledge of the nomadic Arabs having already been reached by the message of Christianity. Justin,

[1] To be quite prudent, one has to take this estimate as applying to the time when the author of Acts wrote (*i.e.* about thirty years later), not to the days of Paul.

[2] Just in the same way as he probably exaggerated the effects produced by the measures to which he had himself resorted.

[3] The figure employed by the author of the epistle to Diognetus, who compares Christians in the world to the soul in the body, presupposes, however, a certain vigour in the expansion of Christianity, even although this vigour may have been largely exaggerated.

as a native of Samaria, might quite well know about these tribes. In any case, the other notice is of some importance, viz., that by the age of Justin the Gentile Christians already outnumbered the Jewish Christians. Still more significant, of course, is the statement of pseudo-Clemens Soter, writing about fifteen years later, to the effect that the Christians were more numerous than the Jews (§ 13). For, even if this notice represents a purely subjective estimate, even if it holds true in the first instance only of the special circle which the author had in view (*i.e.* Rome), still it must remain an illuminating fact that a prominent Roman Christian, *circa* 170 A.D., was under the impression that the Christians were already superior numerically to the Jews.

The language employed by Celsus (§ 15) serves as a welcome corrective of the Christian exaggerations. True, Celsus also exaggerates. But he exaggerates in an opposite direction. He makes out as if Christianity were already *in extremis* owing to the rigour of the imperial regulations under Marcus Aurelius. This, of course, is not worth serious discussion. Nevertheless, the mere fact that he could give vent to such an idea, proves that there was no question as yet of enormous crowds of Christians throughout the empire.[1]

The general theory, that the church had already spread all over the world, also underlies the assertions of Irenæus (§ 17) and Clement of Alexandria (§ 18). Nevertheless the statements of the latter author

[1] The statement made by the martyr Papylus before the magistrate (§ 16) shows that there were Christians in his day in every province and town of Asia.

deserve consideration, for he met with many people from various quarters, and testifies, moreover, that "not a few" philosophers had betaken themselves to Christianity. The remarks of Irenæus, again, have some weight as regards the churches in Germany and among the Celts at any rate—however worthless they may be as regards Iberia, etc. On the former churches Irenæus could speak from personal knowledge, and it is they who are meant in his allusions to barbarian tribes who possessed true Christianity, although they had not the scriptures in their own language.

The information given by Polycrates (§ 19), bishop of Ephesus, is independent of any theory, so that it possesses great value. He testifies that he had come to have personal acquaintance with Christians from all parts of the world, *i.e.* of the empire; and this was written *circa* 190 A.D.

"Already," exclaims Tertullian (§ 20), "there are Christians in almost every township," or again, in language which is somewhat milder but none the less highly coloured with exaggeration, "the larger number in every township are Christian." By 197 A.D. Christianity must have increased extraordinarily in Carthage and throughout the proconsular province, otherwise Tertullian could never have written as he did, nor could he have employed the large numbers of Christians without more ado as a menace to the pagans. Furthermore, we may believe him when he declares that no locality, no quarter of his native city, was destitute of Christians, and that they were to be found in all ranks of society up to the very highest. The substance of the despondent complaints made by

the heathen about the increase of Christians is thus reproduced in the very terms in which they were uttered (cp. Cæcilius in *Min. Felix*, § 21, who finds church buildings and priests in existence, and who therefore must have written a considerable time after Tertullian). Christians were to be encountered at every turn, and people felt restricted and menaced by them in their very homes. Tertullian speaks of "so many thousands" (tantis milibus hominum), and this would be no exaggeration; while if Christianity went on increasing throughout the following century by the same rate of progression in Carthage and the proconsular province, the whole district must have been predominantly Christian by the time of Constantine, so that one can understand how that emperor (§ 26) could regard it as substantially a Christian country. Cyprian's activity falls midway between Tertullian's *Apology* and Constantine, and one gets a vivid impression, from his correspondence, that the Carthaginian Christians now numbered many thousands. Cyprian himself asserts (*ep.* xx. 2) that thousands of *litterae pacis*, or "certificates," were issued daily during the Decian persecution. On the other hand, the enumeration of the barbarian tribes where Christians were to be found (in *adv. Jud.* 7) is not based upon reliable information, as is quite plain from the naïve addition of the "many islands unknown to us, which we are unable to reckon up" ("insularum multarum nobis ignotarum et quae enumerare minus possumus").[1]

[1] Nevertheless it is noteworthy that Hippolytus also writes (*Philosoph.*, x. 34): τοιοῦτος ὁ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀληθὴς λόγος, ὦ ἄνθρωποι Ἕλληνές τε καὶ βάρβαροι, Χαλδαιοί τε καὶ Ἀσσύριοι, Αἰγύπτιοί τε καὶ

The evidence of Origen (§ 22A) is all the more welcome, as *he forms the first and only Christian narrator who bears witness to the relative paucity of Christians.* Indeed, in witnessing (i) to the fact that there were still a number of nations within as well as without the empire ("non solum barbarae, sed etiam nostrae") to which Christianity had not penetrated, or in which only an extremely small fraction of people (perhaps the population on the frontiers) had heard the gospel,[1] Origen shakes off the dogmatic theory already mentioned; and this is all the more significant, inasmuch as he accepts the legends about Thomas having gone to the Parthians, Andrew to the Scythians, etc. In the second place (ii) he shows that no such thing as an entirely Christian town was yet in existence—for such we must take to be the meaning of the passage in *c. Cels.*, III. xxx. (though

Λίβυες, Ἰνδοί τε καὶ Αἰθίοπες, Κελτοί τε καὶ οἱ στρατηγοῦντες Λατῖνοι, πάντες τε οἱ τὴν Εὐρώπην Ἀσίαν τε καὶ Λιβύην κατοικοῦντες, οἷς σύμβουλος ἐγὼ γίνομαι (see above, p. 157). This passage does not prove, of course, that there were local Christians in all these districts, but it shows how the Christian preacher and author felt he was the teacher of all nations, not in an abstract but in quite a concrete sense, and how already his eye was fixed on every individual. It is Cyprian's age that furnishes us with our first notice of the number of Christians in a Christian community, viz., in that of Rome (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 43). The notice, of course, is indirect, for the Roman bishop Cornelius merely states the number of the clergy and the number of those supported by the church.

[1] It is instructive to find that among the nations whom he mentions in this connection are some to whom Tertullian (*loc. cit.*) declares that Christianity had won its way. Origen, however, does not deny that certain individuals out of these nations had heard the gospel preached; besides, adopting a looser way of speaking, he writes several times as if Christianity had spread all over the world.

it may also be interpreted in a different sense). Thirdly (iii), he admits, in controversy with Celsus, that when Christians are numbered relatively to the citizens of the empire, they are still πάνυ ὀλίγοι ("quite few in number"), although, compared to their own original numbers, they now represent a multitude (πλῆθος). From the large and steady increase of Christians (iv) he infers that their religion will in days to come supplant all others and rule unrivalled, while at the same time (v) he draws attention to the increasing diffusion of Christianity among the rich, among people of good position, and among matrons, explaining further (vi), as against Celsus, that Christian martyrs were hitherto ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα εὐαρίθμητοι.[1] All these are observations which show Origen to very great advantage as compared with his predecessors. And even his remarks upon the number of Jewish Christians are of weight. Porphyry's statement is instructive (§ 22B), just because it reproduces the impression made upon wide circles of paganism by the expansion of Christianity. Evidently Christians were to be found in all quarters.

In the days of Philip the Arabian, Origen had stated that there was not yet a single town wholly Christian. Two generations later, Lucian the martyr mentions whole cities ("urbes integrae," § 23) which were Christian.[2] A Syrian himself, he made this statement in Nicomedia, and as a matter of fact we

[1] This occurs of course in a polemical connection which made it natural for Origen to represent the number of Christian martyrs at as small a figure as possible.

[2] Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 7) had already remarked, with reference to Phrygia and the adjoining provinces, that they included "the most populous churches."

know that at the beginning of the fourth century there were localities in Asia, Phrygia, and Syria which were practically Christian altogether. The impression left by the latter provinces upon Lucian's mind led him to declare that "pars paene mundi iam maior" belonged to the Christian religion. Note the "paene." Christians still constituted the smaller half of the population in these districts, but in several quarters their numbers were already equivalent to one-half. On this point we can credit Lucian's testimony, while at the same time we are bound to distrust Tertullian, who had made a similar statement 110 years earlier. Lucian's assertion is also borne out by one passage in a rescript of Maximinus Daza (§ 24), who observes, in reference to the same districts (viz., Syria and Asia Minor), that "almost everyone has abandoned belief in the gods and attached himself to the Christian people."

Nothing is to be learned from the statements of Lactantius (§ 25), for, as we have seen, both Origen and the evidence of the fourth century contradict his assertion that Christianity had penetrated to all the barbarian tribes by the age of Decius. The observations of Eusebius (§ 27), however, deserve some further notice. No doubt he neither did nor could give a history of the expansion of Christianity, partly because he had no sources at his disposal for such a task, partly because the dogmatic character of his historical conceptions permitted him to describe, not a gradual extension, but simply a more inward expansion. The apostles, according to Eusebius too, had already made Christianity an extensive movement by distributing amongst themselves the task of spreading

it completely over all the world.[1] In fact, Eusebius went a step further in this direction. Christ, he held, had himself filled the world with his holy name, and μύριοι ὅσοι had already come to him from regions far remote. In this connection the legend of the correspondence between Jesus and Abgar of Edessa was of supreme importance to him, since it came in as a sort of substitute for the evidence, which otherwise was awanting, of Jesus having widened the range of his activity far beyond the Jews and Palestine (cp. vol. i. pp 83 f.). Down to the reign of Commodus, Eusebius knew of nothing important enough to deserve mention in this connection; he contents himself with merely repeating over and again how numerous and widely spread the Christians were in all directions, noting also the entrance of the new religion into the βασιλεύουσα πόλις under Claudius, and the attention paid thereto by pagan authors under Domitian. But for the age of Commodus he was in possession of a special contemporary source (connected perhaps with the Acts of Apollonius); he was well aware that the propaganda of Christianity had made a remarkable advance during that period, and that in Rome especially a large number of prominent and wealthy people went over to this religion together with all their households and families.[2] Thereupon,

[1] He does mention evangelists (iii. 37. 1 f.) who had preached τοῖς ἔτι πάμπαν ἀνηκόοις τοῦ τῆς πίστεως λόγου after the age of the apostles; this denotes, however, not lands and peoples hitherto unreached, but merely such parts of these countries as had not yet heard anything of the gospel.

[2] This statement is corroborated by the marriage-laws laid down by Callistus, bishop of Rome, with reference to matrons (cp. vol. i. pp. 211 f.).

he singles out two other stages in the growth of the propaganda, viz., under Philip the Arabian and during the decades immediately preceding the last great persecution. As to the latter period, he states (in passages which have not been included above) that Christians were now to be found occupying the chief places of honour at court and in the State, not excluding the position of governor, while their religion enjoyed high esteem as well as perfect liberty among the Greeks and the barbarians. The number of Christians, whom he describes as the most populous of all nations, had also become so large that the church buildings everywhere were too small, so that they had to be pulled down in order to make room for new and larger structures. The horizon of Eusebius, we must not forget, stretched from Alexandria over Palestine and Syria nearly to Nicomedia, and we have already ascertained that these were the countries in which Christians were most numerous. Of the West and of Rome Eusebius did not know much, so that we cannot give absolute credence to his assertion that Maxentius was originally favourable to the Christians *in order that he might please and flatter the Roman populace.* All that we know of the spread and strength of Christianity in Rome, from authentic sources dating from the fourth century, renders it utterly improbable that during the first decade of that century Christians were so numerous in Rome, or had such control of public opinion, that Maxentius was induced to assume for a time the mask of favour to their cause. Eusebius at this point was availing himself of a pragmatism which would apply to the East, but not to Rome.

These remarks may cover all the more important points suggested by the above collection of passages. As for the stages of the mission and its history, the outstanding revivals subsequent to the life and labours of Paul are denoted by (1) the era of Commodus and his immediate successors; and (2) by the years 260–303 A.D. In both of these periods, particularly in the latter, it is obvious that a large increase accrued to Christianity. It was then also that the erection of roomier churches began (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 1).

CHAPTER II.

ON THE INWARD SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE inner spread of Christianity comes out primarily and pre-eminently in the sense, felt by Christians, of their own strength. Evidence of this feeling is furnished by the zeal they displayed in the extension of the faith, by their consciousness of being the people of God and of possessing the true religion, as well as by their impulse to annex any element of worth and value. These factors have been already noticed. But the inward expansion of Christianity can be verified at other points, and in what follows we shall survey its spread (1) among the aristocratic, the wealthy, the cultured, and the official classes; (2) at court; (3) in the army; and (4) among women.

§ 1. *The spread of Christianity among the aristocratic, the cultured, the wealthy, and the official classes.* "You see your calling, brethren," writes Paul in 1 Cor. i. 26–27; "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many of noble birth—nay, the foolish things of the world has God chosen, that he might put the wise to shame; and the weak things of the world has God chosen, that he might put the strong things to shame; and the base things of the world, and things despised, has God chosen, even things

that are not, that he might bring to nought the things that are, so that no flesh should glory before him."[1] Other evidence, covering the period between the primitive age and that of Marcus Aurelius, confirms the view that in the contemporary Christian communities the lower classes, slaves, freedmen, and labourers, very largely predominated. Celsus (*c. Cels.*, I. xxvii., III. xviii., xliv.; VIII. lxxv, etc.) and Cæcilius (in Minutius Felix)[2] explicitly assert this, and the apologists admit the fact.[3] Even the officials of the Christian church frequently belonged to the lowest class (see above, vol. i. p. 209).

Even Paul, however, indicates that some people who were wise and mighty and of good birth had become Christians. And this is borne out by the book of Acts. The proconsul Sergius Paulus was brought over to the faith in Cyprus (xiii. 7–12),[4] Dionysius the Areopagite in Athens (xvii. 34), and "not a few women of good position" in Thessalonica (xvii. 4). So with Beroea (xvii. 12). Priscilla, the coadjutor of Paul, must also be assigned to the upper classes, on account of her pre-eminent culture (see below, under § 4); and Pliny informs Trajan that "many of all ranks" (multi omni ordinis) in Bithynia

[1] Origen (*c. Cels.*, III. xlviii.) observes, on this passage: "It is possible that these words have led some to suppose that no wise, cultured, or intelligent person embraces the Christian faith."

[2] See v. vii., xii.; also Lucian's *Peregrin.*, 12, 13, and Aristides Rhetor, *Orat.* 46 (Christians do not occupy seats in the civic council).

[3] But they make it out to be an honour to Christianity.

[4] See Lightfoot's article in the *Contemporary Review*, vol. xxxii. (1878), pp. 290 f., Kellner in the *Catholik* (1888), pp. 389 f., and Wendt's commentary upon Acts, pp. 227 f.

had gone over to the Christian sect. The epistle of James inveighs against hard-hearted Christian proprietors, of whom it draws a melancholy sketch, complaining also that they are unduly favoured even at the services of the church. In Rome a distinguished lady ("insignis femina"), Pomponia Græcina, was converted (see below, under § 4), followed not long afterwards by the consul Titus Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla (see under § 2). These and similar results must ere long have attracted a large number of adherents to the local Christian church from the better classes.[1] Ignatius, in his epistle to the Roman church, assumes that it was so influential as to have the power of hindering his martyrdom, a fear which would have been unreasonable had not the church contained members whose riches and repute enabled them to intervene in this way either by bribery or by the exercise of personal influence. The "Shepherd" of Hermas shows us that such people did exist at Rome. We read there of Roman Christians who are "absorbed in

[1] Dio Cassius relates (lxvii. 14) that many others, besides Clemens and Domitilla, who had apostatized to Jewish customs, were condemned by Domitian on the score of "atheism"; *καὶ οἳ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἳ δὲ τῶν γοῦν οὐσιῶν ἐστηρήθησαν· ἡ δὲ Δομιτίλλα ὑπερωρίσθη μόνον εἰς Πανδατείρειαν* ("And some were put to death, while others were stripped at least of their property. Domitilla was merely banished to Pandetaria"; cp. lxviii. 1, where we are told how Nerva prohibited accusations of atheism and Judaizing). All these people were evidently Christians, and indeed, to some extent at least, people of property. Cp. the inscriptions found in the catacomb of Domitilla, and de Rossi in *Bullett.* (1865), pp. 17 f., 33 f., 89 f.; (1874), pp. 5 f., 68 f., 122 f.; (1875), pp. 5 f. Even Acilius Glabrio, the senator and ex-consul also mentioned by Dio, was possibly a Christian.

business and wealth and friendship with pagans and many other affairs of this world" (*ἐμπεφυρμένοι πραγματείαις καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ φιλίαις ἐθνικαῖς καὶ ἄλλαις πολλαῖς πραγματείαις τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, *Mand.* x. 1), and of others who "have won riches and renown among pagans" (*πλουτήσαντες καὶ γενόμενοι ἔνδοξοι παρὰ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*).[1] Hermas frequently has occasion to mention the rich members of the church, and his reproofs of their conduct are severe.[2] In the appendix to his *Apology* (II. ii.), Justin relates the conversion of a prominent Roman lady, and Christianity secured men of culture in her apologists. This was conspicuously the case with the best of the so-called "gnostic" scholars and thinkers. No one can peruse the extant fragments of Valentinus without feeling moved by the lofty spirit and choice culture of the man. And the same holds true of his pupils, Ptolemæus and Heracleon, as may be seen from the former's letter to Flora, and the latter's commentary on the gospel of John. Marcion, too, was so well off that he could present the church of Rome with 200,000 sesterces (see above, vol. i. p. 194).

The age of Commodus marks a distinct stage in the movement. Founding on a source which is no

[1] He continues thus: *ὑπερηφανίαν μεγάλην ἐνεδύσαντο καὶ ὑψηλόφρονες ἐγένοντο καὶ κατέλιπον τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ οὐκ ἐκολλήθησαν τοῖς δικαίοις, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνέζησαν, καὶ αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡδυτέρα αὐτοῖς ἐφαίνετο* ("They invested themselves with a mighty pride and became high-minded, and abandoned the truth, nor did they cleave to the righteous but held intercourse with pagans. Such was the path of life which seemed more pleasant to them," *Sim.*, viii. 9).

[2] *Sim.*, i.: *τί ὧδε ὑμεῖς ἑτοιμάζετε ἀγροὺς καὶ παρατάξεις πολυτελεῖς καὶ οἰκοδομὰς καὶ οἰκήματα μάταια* [cp. vol. i. p. 117]; *Vis.*, i. 1. 8, ii. 2, iii. 6. 5 f., iii. 9. 3 f., iii. 11. 3; *Mand.*, viii. 3, xii. 1–2; *Sim.*, ii. iv., viii. 8, ix. 20. 1 f., ix. 30. 4 f., ix. 31. 1 f.

longer extant (see pp. 180 f.), Eusebius relates how the preaching of Christianity spread throughout all classes at this period, *ὥστε ἤδη καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὖ μάλα πλούτῳ καὶ γένει διαφανῶν πλείους ἐπὶ τὴν σφῶν ὁμόσε χωρεῖν πανοικί τε καὶ παγγενῆ σωτηρίαν.* This he proceeds to illustrate by the case of Apollonius at Rome, who belonged at any rate to the upper classes, and indeed was in all likelihood a senator.[1] Not much later than this, perhaps, we should date the inscription from Ostia (see above, p. 41), which proves that some members of the *gens* Annæa were Christians, and in the same way it is indubitable that a number of the Pomponii had died as Christians by the close of the second century.[2] Tertullian's language[3] tallies with this. He narrates how the pagans complained of people "of all ranks" ("omnis dignitatis," *ad nat.* i. 1, *Apol.* i.) going over to Christianity, and he himself claims that Christianity has gained possession of "conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, *palatium*, *senatum*, *forum*" [cp. above, p. 155]; also *ad Scap.*, iv.–v.: "Tot viri ac feminae omnis dignitatis . . . . contubernales suos illic unusquisque cognoscet, videbit illic fortasse et tui ordinis viros et matronas et principales quasque personas

[1] Cp. on this Klette, *Texte u. Unters.*, xv., Heft 2, pp. 50 f., and Neumann (*op. cit.*), p. 80. Pseudo-Linus 3 presupposes the conversion of senators under Commodus: "Innotuerant hoc eis celeri nuntio qui fuerant ex senatoribus illuminati."

[2] See de Rossi, *Rom. sott.*, ii. tab. 49/50, Nos. 22, 27, and tab. 41, No. 48.

[3] Tertullian himself was a distinguished lawyer in Rome before he became a Christian (Eus., *H.E.*, ii. 4). There is nothing, in my judgment, to upset the hypothesis that he is the lawyer whose works are quoted in the Digests.

et amicorum tuorum vel propinquos vel amicos. . . . Clarissimi viri et clarissimae feminae" (translated above on p. 156).[1] Similar testimony is borne by Clement and Origen. The former devoted a special treatise to the problem, "quis dives salvetur," and the volume discusses, not rich people who require conversion, but those who are Christians already.[2] Origen tells the same tale.[3] If it had been possible at an earlier period to declare that Christians held no offices, and that they had no seats on a civic council, if they could be charged once upon a time with "barrenness in practical affairs" ("infructuositas in negotiis") and "most contemptible indolence" ("contemptissima inertia"), the day for such reproaches had passed, by the middle of the third century. Throughout the larger churches many Christians were to be found who, by birth or wealth, belonged to good society; people who had so much to lose, that a persecution was a doubly severe test of faith, as both

[1] Clement (*Strom.*, vi. 18. 167) asserts that not a few philosophers had already turned Christians; and it must also be read as a sign of the times, when we find the governor of Arabia asking the prefect of Egypt to send Origen to him that he might listen to his lectures (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19). Compare the introduction to pseudo-Justin's "Address to the Greeks," in the Syriac edition, which describes the author as "Ambrosius, a high dignitary of Greece, who has become a Christian," and tells how his "fellow-senators" had raised a protest against him.

[2] Cp. ii. f. The *Paedagogus* also shows that the church, for which its instructions were designed, embraced a large number of cultured people.

[3] *c. Cels.*, III. ix.: *νῦν μὲν οὖν τάχα, ὅτε διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν προσερχομένων τῷ λόγῳ καὶ πλούσιοι καὶ τινες τῶν ἐν ἀξίωμασι καὶ γυναῖα τὰ ἁβρὰ καὶ εὐγενῆ ἀποδέχονται τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου, τολμήσει τις λέγειν διὰ τὸ δοξάριον προίστασθαί τινας τῆς κατὰ Χριστιανοὺς διδασκαλίας;* [cp. vol. i. p. 436]; see also II. lxxix.

Cyprian[1] and Eusebius[2] recognize. The civil service, too, was widely permeated by Christianity. The "Octavius" of Minutius Felix plunges us into that circle even thus early in the history of the faith, while the second rescript issued by Valerian in 258 against the Christians takes notice of none but the upper classes and the members of Cæsar's household, outside the clergy (Cypr., *ep.* lxxx. 1: "Ut senatores et egregii viri et equites Romani dignitate amissa etiam bonis spolientur et si adempti facultatibus Christiani esse perseveraverint, capite quoque multentur, matronae ademptis bonis in exilium relegentur, Caesariani autem . . . . confiscentur et vincti in Caesarianas possessiones descripti mittantur" = "Senators and prominent men and Roman knights are to lose their position, and moreover be stripped of their property; if they still persist in being Christians after their goods have been taken from them, they are to be beheaded. Matrons are to be deprived of their property and banished into exile. But

[1] In *de lapsis* vi., however, he draws a repulsive picture of the entirely secular life of the rich Christians.

[2] Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 9: ἐξαιρέτως ἐκεῖνοι θαυμασιώτεροι, οἱ πλούτῳ μὲν καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ δόξῃ, λόγῳ τε καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ διαπρέψαντες πάντα γε μᾶλλον δεύτερα θέμενοι τῆς . . . . πίστεως ("Still more wonderful were those who, though conspicuous for their wealth, birth, and high position, and though eminent in learning and philosophy, yet ranked everything second to their faith"). Even by the time that the Decian persecution broke out in Alexandria, there were many local Christians among the leading people and officials of the city; cp. Dionys. Alex. in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 41. 11: πολλοὶ μὲν εὐθέως τῶν περιφανεστέρων οἱ μὲν ἀπήντων δηδιότες, οἱ δὲ δημοσιεύοντες ὑπὸ τῶν πράξεων ἤγοντο ("And many of the more eminent people came forward at once in terror, while others, in government service, were induced by their public duties").

members of Cæsar's household are to have their goods confiscated and be sent in chains by appointment to the estates of Cæsar"). This rescript shows, more clearly than any single passage[1] could, the extent to which Christianity had already spread among the upper classes. From these classes sprung bishops like Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Anatolius, and Paul of Samosata, whose demeanour was that of prominent statesmen—Paul of Samosata, moreover, discharging the duties of a ducenarius in addition to his episcopal functions. Dionysius enumerates (in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 11. 18), among the things he suffered for Christianity in the reign of Decius, "Sentences, confiscations, proscriptions, seizure of goods, loss of dignities, contempt of worldly glory, scorn of praise from governors and councillors" (*ἀποφάσεις, δημεύσεις, προγραφάς, ὑπαρχόντων ἁρπαγάς, ἀξιωμάτων ἀποθέσεις, δόξης κοσμικῆς ὀλιγορίας, ἐπαίνων ἡγεμονικῶν καὶ βουλευτικῶν καταφρονήσεις*). Anatolius laboured as a statesman in Alexandria, and was a member of the local city council (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 32).[2]

Eusebius (*H.E.*, viii. 1) gives us the position of matters in the reign of Diocletian (*i.e.* down to 303 A.D.) as follows: "*The emperors*," he says,

[1] Cp., *e.g.*, the tale of Astyrius, who belonged to the senatorial order, in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 16 f.

[2] On this bishop see Gomperz in *Anz. d. k. Wiener Akad.*, Phil.-Hist., Klasse (1901), No. vii. 2. Another Christian, Eusebius by name, who afterwards became bishop of Laodicea, also played a political rôle at Alexandria during this period (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 32). Compare the descriptions of bishop Phileas of Thmuis (viii. 9): *διαπρέψας ἀνὴρ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πολιτείαις τε καὶ λειτουργίαις* ("A man eminent for his patriotism and the services he had rendered to his country").

"*even trusted our members with provinces to govern* (*τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡγεμονίας*) *and discharged them from the duty of offering sacrifice.*"[1] Unfortunately Eusebius has not told us what provinces were committed to Christian governors, just as he fails to mention (in viii. 11)[2] the name of that town in Phrygia whose entire population, including officials, were Christians. Only two Christians of high position are mentioned by him, viz., Philoromus in Alexandria,[3] and a certain Adauctus.[4]

[1] The latter fact has not even yet been properly weighed in any estimate of the situation previous to Constantine. It resembles a recognition of Christianity along administrative lines.

[2] This valuable paragraph runs as follows: Πανδημεὶ πάντες οἱ τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, λογιστής τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσι καὶ ὅλῳ δήμῳ Χριστιανοὺς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες οὐδ' ὁπωστιοῦν τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν ("All the inhabitants of the city, together with the mayor, the governor, and all who held office, and the entire populace to boot, confessed themselves Christians, nor would they obey in the least those who bade them worship idols").

[3] viii. 9: Φιλόρωμος ἀρχήν τινα οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλικῆς διοικήσεως ἐγκεχειρισμένος, ὃς μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τιμῆς ὑπὸ στρατιώταις δορυφορούμενος ἑκάστης ἀνεκρίνετο ἡμέρας ("Philoromus held a high position in the imperial government of Alexandria, and dispensed justice daily, attended by soldiers, as befitted his dignity and Roman post of honour").

[4] viii. 11: καί τις ἕτερος Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀξίας ἐπειλημμένος, Ἄδαυκτος ὄνομα, γένος τῶν παρ' Ἰτάλοις ἐπισήμων, διὰ πάσης διελθὼν ἀνὴρ τῆς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι τιμῆς, ὡς καὶ τὰς καθόλου διοικήσεις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης μαγιστεότητός τε καὶ καθολικότητος ἀμέμπτως διελθεῖν, κ.τ.λ. ("And there was another Roman dignitary, called Adauctus, sprung from a noble Italian house, who had passed through every place of honour under the emperors, so that he had blamelessly filled the general offices of the magistracy, as it is called, and of minister of finance").—Dorymedon was a member of the civic council in Synnada (cp. *Acta Dorym.*), and Dativus is described as a senator in the African *Acta Sat. et Dativi* (cp. Ruinart, *op. cit.* p. 417).

We can see then how even before Constantine the Christian religion had made its way into the government service,[1] just as it had found an entrance, thanks to Clement and Origen, into the world of learning. This is indirectly certified by Porphyry as well, and Arnobius writes (ii. 5) thus: "Tam magnis ingeniis praediti oratores, grammatici, rhetores, consulti juris ac medici, philosophiae etiam secreta rimantes magisteria haec expetunt spretis quibus paulo ante fidebant" ("Orators of such high endowments, scholars, rhetoricians, lawyers, and doctors, these, too, pry into the secrets of this philosophy, discarding what a little before they relied upon").

§ 2. *The spread of Christianity at court.* Let me preface this section with a brief reference to the Jews at the imperial court.[2] We find them there even in the days of Augustus; indeed, inscriptions tell us that they were so numerous as to possess a synagogue of their own.[3] As we read inscriptions of Jewesses at Rome called Flavia Antonina, Aurelia, and Faustina, or of Jews called Aurelius, Claudius, and Julianus, it is natural to conjecture that they included many slaves or freedmen from the court, or their descend-

[1] For Christians who took the office of flamen, see the fifty-sixth canon of Elvira, and Duchesne's *Le concile d'Elvire et les flamines chrétiens.*

[2] Cp. v. Engeström's *Om Judarne i Rom. undre äldre tider och deras katakomber* (Upsala, 1876).

[3] Συναγωγὴ Αὐγουστησίων: *CIGr.*, 9902, 9903; cp. Fiorelli's *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale*, Iscriz. Lat., 1956, 1960; Orelli, 3222 = Garucci, *Dissertaz.* ii. 162. 12. Engeström, Nos. 3, 4, p. 31. Besides this, there was a συναγωγὴ Ἀγριππησίων in Rome (*CIGr.*, 9907; Engeström, No. 2, p. 31), connected, probably, with Agrippa, the friend of Augustus. For other Jewish synagogues in Rome, consult Engeström.

ants.[1] And they had great influence. It was through the good offices of Alityrus, the Jewish actor, who was a great favourite with Nero, that Josephus was presented to the empress Poppæa in Puteoli, and obtained, by her help, the liberation of some Jewish priests (Joseph., *Vita* iii.). The queen herself seems in fact to have been a kind of proselyte (Jos., *Antiq.*, xx. 8. 11). As has been already observed (vol. i. p. 66), the Jews were probably the instigators of the Neronian outburst against the Christians; the Samaritan Thallus, a freedman of Tiberius, was able to lend the Jewish king, Herod Agrippa, a million denarii;[2] the relations between the Herodians and the emperors of the Julian and Claudian dynasties were close;[3] and so on. Previous to the great war, there were certainly a number of ties between the Palestinian Jews and the imperial court, although in the subsequent course of centuries they must have become fewer, and finally disappeared altogether. Neither then nor afterwards

[1] Flavia Antonina: Engeström, No. 3. Quintus Claudius Synesius, No. 8; Annianus, son of Julianus, No. 9; Julianus, son of Julianus, No. 10; Lucina, No. 16; Lucilla, No. 44; Alexander, son of Alexander, No. 18; Valerius, husband of Lucretia Faustina, No. 19; Gaius, No. 24; Julia, No. 27; Alexander, No. 34; Aurelia Camerina, No. 35; Aurelius Joses, husband of Aurelia Anguria, No. 36; Aelia Alexandrina, daughter of Aelia Septima, No. 37; Flavia Dativa Flaviae, No. 38; Marcella, No. 41. On the Jews at the imperial court, see Rénan's *Antéchrist*, p. 9 n. 2, pp. 125 f. (German ed.), Eng. trans., pp. 4 f., 62 f.

[2] Jos., *Antiq.*, xviii. 6. 4. For the court intrigues of Acme, the Jewish slave-girl of the emperor Livia, see *Antiq.*, xvii. 5. 7 f., *Bell. Jud.*, i. 32. 6 f.

[3] Caracalla is reported to have had a Christian wet-nurse ("lacte Christiano," *ad Scap.* iv.), and a Jewish playmate (Spart., *Caracall.*, i.).

had they any direct bearing upon the connection of Christians and the court.

This latter connection has been overgrown by a luxuriant tangle of legend and romance. Peter and Paul are said to have stood before Nero,[1] while John was condemned by Domitian in person, and dozens of their contemporaries at the imperial court are alleged to have become Christians. All this we must simply ignore. More serious attention perhaps should

[1] So the *Acta Petri et Pauli* (Rénan's *Antéchrist, ibid.*); cp. especially c. 31. 36 f., 84. The legend takes many forms in many writers (see also the pseudo-Clementine literature, which, in its extant shape, does not perhaps belong to an earlier period than the opening of the fourth century), and somewhere in the course of the sixth century it was finally shaped in the *Acta Pseudo-Lini* and the *Acta Ner. et Achill.* In the first book of the former Acts, Nero is only mentioned incidentally, but many noble ladies are described as converted, including four concubines of the prefect Agrippa (Agrippina, Eucharia, Euphemia, Dionis), and Xandippe, the wife of Albinus, "Caesaris amicissimi." According to book II., however, the preaching of Christianity proved far more efficacious: "Paul was visited by a mighty concourse from the imperial household, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . And besides, the instructor of the emperor [*i.e.* Seneca] was closely knit to him by ties of friendship, recognizing that he possessed the mind of God" ("Concursus quoque multus de domo Caesarii fiebat ad Paulum, credentium in dominum Jesum Christum . . . . sed et institutor imperatoris adeo est illi amicitia copulatus, videns in eo divinam sententiam"). A magister Cæsaris reads aloud Paul's writings, and many of Nero's personal retinue ("ex familiari obsequio Neronis") follow the apostle. Patroclus, a former page of the emperor, who was then "ad vini officium" (acting as wine-bearer), becomes a Christian. Barnabas, Justus, a certain Paul, Arion Cappadox, Festus Galata, are all Christian servants of Nero, while a distinguished lady, named Plantilla, is a friend of Paul. A section of Nero's court is thus represented as having been Christians. In *Pseudo-Linus*, and still more in the *Acta Ner. et Achill.*, which would more aptly be described as *Acta Domitillae*, many historical names of Christians belonging to the second and third centuries (in the

be paid to Tertullian's statement about Tiberius (in *Apol.* v., reproduced in Eus., *H.E.*, ii. 2), but in the end one is forced to set aside the whole account as unauthentic.

Paul's epistle to the Philippians closes with these words: ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (iv. 22). This implies that the Roman church contained a special group of Christians who belonged to the household of the Cæsar, people who either had had some previous connection with the Philippian church or had recently formed a connection by means of Epaphroditus, the Philippian envoy.[1]

Several years before Philippians was written, Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans. Within the ample

capital and from a wider environment) have been employed, but *all the allusions to the court are imported,* as is shown by the ancient martyrologies, which know nothing of such a phase (cp. Achelis in *Texte u. Unters.,* xi. 2). It was the historical fact of Clement and Domitilla being relatives of Domitian which fired this train of fantasy, although, so far as we know, it did not start till the close of the second century. Thereafter relatives of the emperor are part of the regular stock-in-trade of the apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul (cp. also the *Acta Barnabae auctore Marco,* c. 23: Ἰεβουσσαῖος, συγγενὴς Νερῶνος). Even Livia, Nero's consort, was reported to have been a convert. There is a possibility of several Roman Christians, mentioned in the oldest *Acta Petri* (Vercell.), having been historical personalities. In chap. iii. we read: "Dionysius et Balbus ab Asia, equites Romani, splendidi viri, et senator nomine Demetrius adhaerens Paulo . . . . item de demo Caesaris Cleobius et Ifitus et Lysimachus et Aristeus, et duae matronae Berenice et Filostrate cum presbytero Narcisso." And in chap. viii.: Marcellus senator.

[1] Perhaps they had entertained him. But one must bear in mind that the town of Philippi was almost entirely Latin (or Roman), and that it would therefore be in intimate relations with the capital (cp. Acts xvi. 21).

list of greetings in the sixteenth chapter,[1] Paul groups two sets of people: the Christians belonging to the household of Narcissus and those belonging to that of Aristobulus (10–11). These Christians must therefore have been members of the households of two distinguished men who were not Christians themselves. Now, as we know that during the reign of Claudius no one in Rome was so powerful and so intimate with the emperor as a certain Narcissus, and also that a certain Aristobulus (an uncle of Herod the Great) was living then at the capital as a confidential friend of Claudius, it seems likely that these were the very two persons whose households are mentioned here by the apostle.[2]

At the close of their epistle to Corinth (the so-

[1] Many scholars separate this chapter from the rest of the epistle, and take it as a note to Ephesus. But the reasons for such a *tour de force* do not appear to me satisfactory.

[2] Narcissus died in 54/55, and in my opinion Romans was written in 53/54 (though the majority of critics put it four or five years later). On Narcissus, the freedman and private secretary of Claudius ("ab epistulis"), see *Prosopogr.*, ii. p. 397, and Lightfoot's *Philippians* (third ed.), p. 173: "As was usual in such cases, his household would most probably pass into the hands of the emperor, still, however, retaining the name of Narcissus. One member of the household apparently is commemorated in an extant inscription: TI . CLAVDIO . SP . F . NARCISSIANO (Murat., p. 1150, 4)." See also Hirschfield's remark in the *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, ii. 2, p. 294: "The *πρότερον Ναρκίσσου οὐσία* which passed to the emperor (Wilcken's *Ostraka*, i. 392 f.), is rightly referred to the private secretary of Claudius." So that the Christians of Cæsar's household mentioned in Philippians might be the members of the household of Narcissus mentioned in Romans. Aristobulus was still alive, according to Josephus, *Antiq.*, xx. 1. 2), in 45 A.D. at any rate, but the year of his death has not been preserved. His domestic establishment also may have been transferred to the imperial household (see Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*).

called First Epistle of Clement), in 95–96 A.D., the Roman Christians explain how they entrusted the delivery of the epistle to two seniors who had lived blameless lives among them from youth upwards. At the latest, then, these men must have become Christians by 50 A.D. They were called Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito, and Lightfoot rightly assumes that they were members of the retinue of the emperor, as the wife of Claudius (Messalina) belonged to the *gens* Valeria. Thus they would be among the Christians who sent greetings in Paul's letter to the Philippians.[1]

T. Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla, who were closely related to Domitian, were certainly Christians, and it was as Christians that they were punished[2] in 95–96. Their sons, the presumptive

[1] I pass over the alleged relations between Seneca and Paul and their forged correspondence; nor does it prove anything for our present purpose to find that some members of the *gens* Annæa subsequently became Christians (see pp. 41, 187). There is no warrant for claiming Acte, one of Nero's favourite slaves, as a Christian, and it is a matter of really no moment if names (such as Onesimus, Stephanus, Phœbe, Crescens, Artemas) occur in this environment which also recur in the New Testament. On the other hand, we may note, at this point, that the early (though, of course, entirely fictitious) *Acta Pauli* of the second century mention a queen Tryphæna in Asiatic Antioch, who shows motherly kindness to the Christian Thecla. She is described, and described correctly, as a relative of the emperor; for Tryphæna, the consort of King Polemon of Asia Minor (in the middle of the first century) was connected with the Emperor Claudius (v. Gutschmidt, *Rhein. Museum*, 1864, pp. 176 f.).

[2] *Dio Cassius*, lxvii. 14; Sueton., *Domit.* 15; Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 17; Bruttius, in Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 18. 5. The person, lineage, and place of exile of Domitilla are matters of dispute. Perhaps there were two Christian Domitillas, both of whom were exiled (?). For her lineage see *CIL*, vi. 1, No. 948.

heirs to the throne, were brought up by a Christian mother. The contemporary presbyter-bishop of Rome, Clement, is in all likelihood different from the consul of that name, but nevertheless he may have belonged to the royal household. The murderer of Domitian, a member of Domitilla's household, need not have been instigated by the church, although he is said to have carried out his plot in order to revenge his mistress.[1] Of his Christianity nothing whatever is known.

The traces in Hermas of Christians at court are dim. Hadrian, that inquisitive searcher into all manner of novelties ("omnium curiositatum explorator"), may have busied himself, among other things, with the judicial proceedings against Christians, but his letter to Servian is probably a forgery (Vopisc., *Saturn.* 8), and the statement that he wished to erect a temple to Christ is quite untrustworthy.[2] His freedman Phlegon, who composed a chronicle of the world, perhaps with some assistance from his master,

[1] Suet., *Domit.*, 15. 17; *Dio Cassius*, lxvii. 15–17; Philostr., *Vita Apoll.*, viii. 25.

[2] Lamprid, *Alex.* 43: "Christo templum facere voluit eumque inter deos recipere. quod et Hadrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris iusserat fieri [which is possible], quae hodieque idcirco quia non habent numina dicuntur Hadriani, quia ille ad hoc parasse dicebatur" ("He wished to erect a temple to Christ and to enrol him among the gods—a project which Hadrian also is said to have entertained. For that emperor had ordered temples without images to be erected in every city, and these are to this day called 'Hadrian's,' since they have no idols, and since they are said to have been raised by him for this purpose"). What follows may perhaps apply to Alexander rather than to Hadrian. The legend originated, it may be, not earlier than the third century, as an explanation of the Hadrianic temple nullius dei.

betrays indeed a superficial acquaintance with the life and miracles of Jesus, but he mixes up Christ and Peter (Orig., *c. Cels.*, II. xiv.).

In the proceedings taken against Justin at Rome during the early years of M. Aurelius, one of his pupils is also implicated, Euelpistus by name. He describes himself as an imperial slave (*Acta Justini*, 4), so that Christianity had evidently not died out among the members of the imperial household. Perhaps the Palestine caricature of a crucifix (Mus. Kircher) also belongs to this period. It proves that Christians were still to be found among the royal pages.

Under Commodus we hear of Carpophorus, a Christian "of the emperor's household," whose slave rose to be bishop Callistus (Hippol., *Philos.*, ix. 12). And Irenæus writes (iv. 30. 1) as follows: "Quid autem et hi qui in regali aula sunt fideles, nonne ex eis quae Caesaris sunt habent utensilia et his qui non habent unusquisque eorum secundum suam virtutem praestat?" ("And what of those who in the royal palace are believers? Do they not get the utensils they use from the emperor's property? And does not each one contribute, according to his ability, to those who have no such utensils?"). Which proves that there was quite a group of Christians at court, and that their circumstances were good. For a number of years, too, the royal concubine Marcia (οὖσα φιλόθεος παλλακὴ Κομόδου) was the most influential person at court during this period; as Hippolytus relates, the Roman bishop Victor came and went freely from her presence, while it was though her mediation that he secured the release of

Christians who were languishing in the mines of Sardinia.[1]

As for the age of Septimius Severus, Tertullian (*Apol.* xxxvii.) testifies to the presence of Christians in the royal palace; and in *ad Scapulam* iv. he writes as follows: "Even Severus himself, the father of Antoninus, was mindful of the Christians. For he sought out Proculus the Christian, surnamed Torpacion, the agent of Euhodia, who had once cured him by means of oil, keeping him in the palace to the day of his death . . . . And both men and women of the highest rank, whom Severus knew to be members of this sect, were not merely exempted by him from injury, but also had open testimony borne them by himself, and were publicly restored to us out of the hands of a raging mob" ("Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit; nam et Proculum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodiae procuratorem, qui eum per deum aliquando curaverat, requisivit et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem eius . . . . sed et clarissimas feminas et clarissimos viros Severus, sciens huius sectae esse, non modo non laesit, verum et testimonio exornavit et populo furenti in nos palam restitit").[2] His son, Caracalla, also was on intimate terms with this Christian ("optime noverat"), and Tertullian proceeds to describe him as having had a Christian wet-nurse ("lacte Christiano educatus").[3] Under him

[1] For Marcia, see Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 f. Her friendliness to Christians is attested also by *Dio Cassius*, lxxii. 4.

[2] Tertullian (*de corona* xii.) seems to suggest that there were also Christians in the imperial bodyguard.

[3] The *Acta Charalampi* (Bolland., 10th Feb., pp. 382 f.) mention a daughter of Severus who was a Christian.

died the Christian high chamberlain Prosenes in 217 A.D.; for de Rossi is probably right in concluding from the inscription set up for him by his slaves (*Inscr. Christ.*, i. No. 5, p. 9) that he died a Christian. During the third century the court officials became more powerful than ever—although even in the first century individual freedmen of the imperial house had come to exercise a commanding influence in the management of the State. Originally the court appointments and the offices of State were sharply distinguished. While the latter could not be held save by freemen of knightly or senatorial rank, the former were filled up with imperial freedmen and slaves. But gradually the knights invaded the imperial household, while, on the other hand, freedmen and slaves were ennobled and admitted to the higher branches of the civil service. It was still customary, however, for imperial freedmen or the "Cæsariani" to hold the court appointments (in which a graduated hierarchy of offices also obtained), and frequently they became the most influential persons in the State. Thus even a Christian, if he possessed the confidence of the emperor, could become a man of importance in the empire.

The Syrian royal ladies were in part favourably disposed to Christianity. Julia Mammæa, we are told, summoned Origen to Antioch, and Hippolytus dedicated a volume to her.[1] Orosius, therefore,

[1] Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 21. On Hippolytus and Mammæa see my *History of Christian Literature*, i. pp. 605 f. We do not know who the Severina is, mentioned on the statue of Hippolytus, though some have thought of Aquilia Severa, the consort of Elagabalus.

dubs her a Christian (vii. 18). The court of her son, the emperor Alexander, was composed of many Christians,[1] and he himself was so favourable to them that he was celebrated by the Christians not long after his death as one who had been secretly a fellow-believer. His sayings prove that this "Syrian chief of the synagogue" (Lamprid., *Alex.* 28) really busied himself with the affairs of the Christian religion.

The state of matters remained the same under Philip the Arabian, who also was claimed ere long as a secret Christian (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 34). Origen wrote to him and to his consort Severa (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 36). And Cyprian, looking back on this period, writes angrily that "the majority of the bishops, scorning the stewardship of God, became stewards of earthly monarchs" ("episcopi plurimi divina procuratione contempta procuratores regum saecularium facti sunt," *de lapsis* vi.). So that it was not merely the laity, but the very bishops as well, who pressed forward into the most influential and lucrative appointments at the royal court![2]

[1] Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 28: *πρὸς τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου οἶκον ἐκ πλειόνων πίστων συνεστῶτα.*

[2] Naturally there was a constant interchange between court appointments in the capital and throughout the imperial possessions in the provinces.—For the landed property of the emperors during the first three centuries, see Hirschfeld's study in the *Beiträge z. alten Geschichte*, Bd. 2, H. 1, pp. 45 f., H. 2, pp. 284 f. "The imperial property in the provinces was far more valuable than it was in Italy. Egypt deserves mention primarily in this connection, since Augustus had taken it over in his capacity of assignee of the Egyptian kings. . . . But of all the provinces of the empire (p. 295), none had so enormous an imperial property to show as Africa."

Like Maximinus Thrax, both Decius[1] and Valerian after him purged the court of Christians. At the opening of Valerian's reign their number had again increased. "For the emperor was friendly and favourable to the servants of God; none of the previous emperors, none even of those who were said to be Christians, ever behaved with such kindness and favour to them as did Valerian. He treated them with quite undisguised friendliness and goodwill at the commencement of his reign; *his whole court was full of pious people; it was a veritable church of God*" (Dionys. Alex. in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 10). But this did not continue. And in the second rescript of 258 A.D. against the Christians, the following allusion to the "Cæsariani" occurs: "Caesariani quicumque vel prius confessi fuerant vel nunc confessi fuerint confiscentur et vincti in Caesarianas possessiones descripti mittantur" (Cypr., *ep.* lxxx.; see above, p. 189).

The persecution, however, did not last. Under his son Gallienus, the Christians already made their way back into the court, and now increased at such a rate[2] that under Diocletian (whose wife and daughter were Christians) the court at Nicomedia consisted largely of Christians.[3] The early re-

[1] In the *Martyrdom of St Conon* (under Decius) it is related that he was a gardener in the royal garden at Magydus in Pamphylia (cp. von Gebhardt's *Acta Mart. Selecta*, p. 130).

[2] We hear, for example, of Dorotheus, the presbyter of Antioch, being appointed to superintend the imperial dye-works at Tyre (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 32). Incidentally Eusebius remarks (vii. 16) that Astyrius, a Christian of senatorial rank, "was very highly esteemed by the emperors."

[3] Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 11. Compare the parallel passage in Lactantius, *de morte persec.*, 15; also the stories of the courtiers Dorotheus and Gorgonius.

scripts[1] of Diocletian were specially designed to purge the court of them. Eusebius also states that there were Christians at the court of Constantine Chlorus (*Vita Const.*, i. 16), and the same holds true of the court of Licinius.[2]

This sketch, which makes no pretension to be complete, may serve to indicate how Christians made their way into the court at an early period, and how they came there to form a factor which was occasionally quite important.

§ 3. *The spread of Christianity in the army.* The position of a soldier would seem to be still more incompatible with Christianity than the higher offices of state, for not merely had a soldier to "taste blood" like an official, but it fell to him much oftener to perform idolatrous actions (the regimental colours being "sacra"). *Christianity, therefore, never became a religion of the camp*, and all representations of Christianity which make out as if it had diffused itself specially by means of soldiers, are to be eschewed (see vol. i. pp. 385, 461). Upon the other hand, however, particularly among legions stationed in the East, Christian soldiers were to be found as early as the second century, and the number of Christians in the army increased with the general growth of the church. The strict party of believers tried to demonstrate that the Christian religion and the military calling were inconsistent, claiming that Christian soldiers ought to leave the service or else

[1] The epistle of Theonas, which tells of a Christian librarian of Diocletian, is a forgery.

[2] See Jerome's *Chron.*, ad ann. 2337: "Licinius Christianos de palatio suo pellit" ("Licinius expels the Christians from his palace").

suffer martyrdom. They exulted over every case in which a soldier, under the impulse of his Christian conscience, deliberately committed a breach of military discipline and was marched off to prison for his offence. But such cases were rare. One or two resignations certainly did take place, as well as acts of blunt insubordination; but Christian soldiers considered that it was quite permissible for them to respect the regulations and ceremonies current in the service, while the church, relying on Luke iii. 14, and on the centurions of Capernaum and Cæsarea (cp. also the centurion at the foot of the cross), shut her eyes to such matters from the very first. In fact, by the opening of the third century, the large body of Christians took it amiss if any soldier endangered his fellow-soldiers (or, under certain circumstances, the whole of the local church) by any outburst of Christian fanaticism. As for the rigorous party, they hardly made anything of their prohibitions. And yet, even though he managed to come to some terms about the usual official regulations, the Christian soldier occupied a more perilous position than the ordinary Christian. At any moment his connection with the forbidden sect might occasion summary proceedings against him; besides, he might be expected to perform actions which even the laxer Christian conscience forbade. Martyrs in the army therefore appear to have been relatively more numerous than among civilians; at any rate they are to be met with even during periods which have no record of any other martyrs. Yet there cannot have been very many Christian soldiers in the army before the reign of Diocletian, otherwise special

repressive orders would have issued. And none such is known to have existed.[1] It was under Diocletian that the authorities first became alive to the situation. The great persecution was directed primarily against Christian soldiers, and Licinius followed it up by a special edict against them. Conversely, the public toleration and preferential treatment of the Christian religion began with the affixing of the cross to the colours of the regiments (by Constantine during his expedition against Maxentius).

Such is, in brief, the scope covered by the theme "the Christian and the soldier" during the pre-Constantine period.[2] A concise collection of the most important items now falls to be subjoined.

In 2 Tim. ii. 3 f. and 2 Clem. xxxvii., the career or organization of the military profession is quite frankly adduced as a pattern for Christians.[3] The oldest evidence for Christians, and indeed for a pretty large number of Christians, in a legion is furnished by the contemporary accounts of the miracle of the rain in the reign of M. Aurelius (Apollinaris and Tertullian in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 5). The legion in question was that of Melitene (12), and it is not surprising that of all legions it should contain a considerable percentage of Christians, since it was recruited from districts where Christians were

[1] See below, however, on Eus. vii. 15.

[2] On the church's use of figures and descriptions drawn from the military calling, see above, pp. 19 f. The possibility of the language of the camp having influenced the ecclesiastical dialect in Africa must be left an open question.

[3] Among the charges brought by Eusebius against Maximinus Daza (*H.E.*, viii. 14. 11) is that of having rendered the army effeminate. Eusebius's feelings thus are those of a loyal citizen of the empire.

particularly numerous.[1] Neither then nor subsequently did any Christian censure these soldiers for their profession, and Clement of Alexandria plainly assumes that the military vocation is consistent with the confession of the Christian faith.[2] Tertullian[3] was the sternest of the strict party who held that the army and Christianity were irreconcilable; yet not merely does he testify to the presence of Christians in the army during his own day, but he was enough of a politician at the same time to lay a satisfied stress upon this very fact before civil governors. Did it not refute the accusation that Christians were idle anchorites and gymnosophists?[4] Nevertheless

[1] Even at a later period the legion still had Christians in its ranks; cp. Eus., *H.E.*, v. 5. 1, and Gregory of Nyssa's *Orat. II. in XL. Martyras* (opp. Paris, 1638, t. iii. p. 505 f.). The forty martyrs (see below) also belonged to this legion. See my essay on this miracle of the rain in the *Sitzungsber. d. k. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1894, pp. 835 f.

[2] *Protrept.*, x. 100: στρατευόμενόν σε κατείληφεν ἡ γνῶσις, τοῦ δίκαια σημαίνοντος ἄκουε στρατηγοῦ ("Has knowledge come upon you in military service? then listen to that Commander who gives righteous orders"), which does not, of course, mean that one must give up the army.

[3] Tatian's (*Orat.* xi.) phrase, τὴν στρατηγίαν παρῄτημαι ("I renounce the office") refers to the prætorship, but he, too, was undoubtedly opposed to the military calling.

[4] *Apol.* xxxvii.: "Vestra omnia implevimus . . . . castra ipsa." xlvii.: "Non sumus Brachmanae aut Indorum gymnosophistae . . . . militamus vobiscum" [cp. vol. i. 341]. For Christians in the army at Lambese, see *ad Scap.* iv. Here, however, he is concealing his own opinions, just as in the *Apologia*, where he simply says that Christians pray "pro mora finis." He is also concealing that fervid longing for the advent of Christ's kingdom which finds expression in his exposition of the words, "Thy kingdom come." His private views on the army are given in *de idolol.* xix. and *de corona militis* (cp. also *de pallio* v.: non milito, and *de resurr.* xvi.).

the incompatibility of the higher positions in the army with the Christian vocation was settled for Tertullian by one consideration, viz., that such officers had to perform judicial duties amongst others; while surely the private soldier, he argues, cannot be a Christian, since a man cannot be in two camps at the same time—in that of Christ, in that of the devil—nor can a man serve two masters. Furthermore, in disarming Peter, Christ stripped every Christian of his sword, and this renders every appeal to the soldiers who came to John or to the centurion at Capernaum quite untenable (*de idol.* xix.). The soldier who refused a military crown and was executed for his refusal, was hailed with triumph by Tertullian. He devoted a special treatise to this case—which[1] plainly proves that the case was quite unique, and that other Christians in the army accepted the military crown without any hesitation.

Origen, too, was one of the stricter party. When

[1] This is brought out with still greater clearness in the view of the subject which was current in Christian circles (ch. i.). "Abruptus, praeceps, mori cupidus," such a soldier was dubbed ("headstrong, rash, and eager for death"). "Musitant denique tam bonam et longem sibi pacem periclitari . . . . ubi prohibemur coronari?" ("They murmur at their prolonged and happy peace being endangered. . . . Where, they ask, are we forbidden to get crowned?"). In ch. xi. Tertullian expounds still more sharply than in the treatise *de idololatria*, the incompatibility of Christianity and the military calling. Here, too, he discusses the question, what is a soldier to do, who is converted when a soldier? At one moment it seems as if he might remain a soldier (Luke iii. 14; Matt. viii. 10; Acts x. 1 f.).—There is always the possibility of taking all precautions against committing any irreligious action as a soldier. But Tertullian recommends only two ways out of the difficulty: either resigning one's post ("ut a multis actum" = as has been done by many) or suffering martyrdom.

Celsus demands that Christians ought to aid the emperor[1] by entering the army, Origen answers by pointing out that they do so by their prayers; martial service is no more to be expected from them than from priests.[2] Finally, Lactantius was another rigorist (*Instit.*, vi. 20. 16). "Militare iusto non licebit, cuius militia est ipsa justitia, neque vero accusare quemquam crimine capitali, quia nihil distat utrumne ferro an verbo potius occidas, quoniam occisio ipsa prohibetur" ("It will not be lawful for the righteous man to engage in warfare. His true warfare is righteousness itself. Nor will he be right in accusing anyone on a capital charge, since there is no difference between killing a person by word or by the sword. Killing itself is prohibited").

But these rigorists brought about no change whatever in the actual situation. There were Christians in the Melitene legion and at Lambese, and Christians were to be found in other legions also. It turned out that the soldier who led Potamiæna to martyrdom in Alexandria (202/3 A.D.) was attached to the Christian faith, though he had not yet received baptism.[3] A similar instance occurred once more in

[1] It is quite obvious from this that Christians were charged with a disinclination to serve in the army, and the charge was undoubtedly well founded. In actual life, however, collisions of this kind were rare, for there can hardly have been many cases of Christians being impressed against their will. See Mommsen's *Röm. Staatsrecht*, ii. $2^{(3)}$, pp. 849 f.; and in *Hermes* xix. (1883), pp. 3 f.; also Neumann, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 127 f.

[2] *c. Cels.*, VIII. lxviii. For Christians as "priests of peace" (sacerdotes pacis), see also Tert., *de spect.*, xvi.

[3] The story of his martyrdom corresponds to that of the soldier in the treatise *de corona*. For some reason or another Basilides (such was his name) was challenged by a fellow-soldier to take an

Alexandria under Decius (cp. Dionys. Alex. in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 41. 16); but still more weighty is the account given by Dionysius of the Decian persecution in the Egyptian capital, where the whole of a small commando (*σύνταγμα στρατιωτικόν*), which had mustered for the trial of some Christians, turned out to be composed either of Christians or of their friends. "And when one who was being tried as a Christian inclined to deny his faith, they gnashed their teeth, made signs to him, held out their hands, and made gestures with all their limbs. Whereupon the attention of everybody was directed to them, but, before they could be seized by anyone, they rushed to the dock and avowed that they were Christians" (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 41. 22 f.). As there had not been any intention, of course, of specially selecting Christian soldiers for this judicial duty, the incident shows how widely Christianity had spread among the army[1] in Egypt. When the Diocletian persecution had passed, and when the question arose of subjecting the "lapsi" to a penitential discipline, the soldiers who had offered sacrifice were mentioned in Egypt as a special class by themselves (Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 2).

The account given by Eusebius (vii. 15) of an officer called Marinus, who was stationed at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, is most instructive. He distinctly states that at this time (during the reign of Gallienus) the Christians were enjoying peace. Marinus was to

oath, which, as a Christian, he refused to do. His refusal was at first construed as a jest. But when he persisted in it, proceedings were instituted against him (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 5).

[1] Compare also the other statement of Dionysius (vii. 11. 20), to the effect that soldiers were included among the victims of Valerian's persecution in Egypt.

be promoted to fill a vacant position as centurion. But another person stepped forward and declared that Marinus was a Christian, and therefore could not, "according to ancient law," hold any Roman office, since he did not sacrifice to the emperors. A discussion ensued, and the judge gave Marinus, who had avowed his Christianity, some time to consider his position. On leaving the tribunal, he was taken by the hand and conducted by the bishop into the church. Then, holding out the volume of the gospels and at the same time pointing to his sword, the bishop bade him decide which he meant to choose. The officer grasped the gospels. On reappearing before the judge, he adhered stedfastly to his faith and was executed. Now this story shows that among officers in the army the profession of Christianity was not tolerated, and it would even seem as though express regulations on the subject were in existence. But it shows also that in practice Christianity was connived at. The authorities always waited for some occasion of conflict to arise.

"The first objects of the persecution were believers in the army," says Eusebius (*H.E.*, viii. 1. 7), as he starts to tell the story of the Diocletian persecution.[1] Lactantius agrees with him. "Datis

[1] Cp. viii. 4: *πλείστους παρῆν τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ὁρᾶν ἀσμενέστατα τὸν ἰδιωτικὸν προασπαζομένους βίον, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἔξαρνοι γένοιντο τῆς περὶ τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸν εὐσεβείας· ὡς γὰρ ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ἐκεῖνος* [cp. Jerome's *Chron.* ad ann. 2317: "Veturius magister militiae Christianos milites persequitur, paulatim ex illo iam tempore persecutione adversus nos incipiente" = Veturius, the military chief, persecutes Christian soldiers, and the persecution now gradually begins to be directed against us], *ἄρτι πρῶτον ἐνεχείρει τῷ κατὰ τῶν στρατευμάτων διωγμῷ, φυλοκρινῶν καὶ διακαθαίρων τοὺς ἐν τοῖς στρατο-*

ad praepositos litteris etiam milites [court officials having been previously mentioned] cogi ad nefanda sacrificia praecepit, ut qui non paruissent, militia solverentur. hactenus furor eius et ira processit nec amplius quicquam contra legem aut religionem dei fecit" (*de mort.* x.: "By instructions issued to the officers, he also had soldiers forced to offer accursed sacrifices, so that those who disobeyed were discharged from the army. Thus far did his fury and anger go. Nor did he do anything further against the laws and religion of God"). The court and the army, the two pillars of the throne, were to be purged of Christians. This determination shows how numerous Christians were in the army,[1] and consequently the dismissal or the martyrdom of soldiers

πέδοις ἀναφερομένους, αἵρεσίν τε διδοὺς ἣ πειθαρχοῦσιν ἧς μετῆν αὐτοῖς ἀπολαύειν τιμῆς ἢ τοὐναντίον στέρεσθαι ταύτης, εἰ ἀντιτάττοιντο τῷ προστάγματι, πλεῖστοι ὅσοι τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας στρατιῶται τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ὁμολογίαν, μὴ μελλήσαντες, τῆς δοκούσης δόξης καὶ εὐπραγίας, ἧς εἶχον, ἀναμφιλόγως προὐτίμησαν ("Many soldiers were to be met with, who cheerfully accepted the private life of civilians that they might not deny the reverent piety due to the creator of the universe. For when the general, whoever he was, started his persecution of the soldiers, separating them into tribes and purging those enlisted in the army, he gave them a choice: either they were to obey and thus reap the honour which was their due, or else to lose that meed of honour if they disobeyed orders. Whereupon a vast number of soldiers, belonging to the kingdom of Christ, unhesitatingly made up their minds at once to prefer his confession to the seeming glory and good fortune which they were enjoying"). Presently executions commenced, which had not originally been contemplated. In *Mart. Pal.*, xi. 20, Eusebius incidentally mentions one confessor from the army.

[1] Cp. *Acta S. Maximiliani* (Ruinart's *Acta Martyr.* Ratisbon, 1859, p. 341): "Dixit Dion proconsul: in sacro comitatu dominorum nostrorum Diocletiani et Maximiani, Constantii et Maximi milites Christiani sunt et militant."

was particularly common during this persecution, while many soldiers of course came also to deny their faith and often to sacrifice. In Melitene and Syria the army was driven to partial rebellion, and it appears that Diocletian scented the plotting of Christians at the back of this (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 6. 8).

Eusebius also relates how Licinius specially purged the army of Christians during his final efforts to hold out against Constantine (*H.E.*, x. 8, *Vita Const.*, i. 54).[1] It was then that the forty soldiers of Sebaste were martyred—one further witness[2] to the existence of many Christians in the ranks of the 12th Thundering ("fulminata") legion.

Soldiers play an important rôle in the Acts of the martyrs. Some instances of this have already been noted, and it would lead us too far afield to state the evidence completely, especially as forgeries were extremely plentiful in this very province of literary effort. Reference need only be made to Getulus, the husband of Symphorosa, and his brother Amantius, to the famous "passio" of Mauricius and the Thebaic legion, etc. Nereus and Achilles (cp. Achelis, in *Texte*

[1] Those aimed at, in the first instance, were the κατὰ πόλιν στρατιῶται (the soldiers in the cities), *i.e.* the police-officers and guardians of the peace, whose importance, like that of the court officials, became steadily superior with every decade to that of the civil service.

[2] No passage in this Testament indicates that it was written by, or that it originated with, soldiers (cp. Bonwetsch, *Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift*, iii. 12, pp. 705 f.; Haussleiter, *ibid.*, pp. 978 f.; Bonwetsch, *Studien z. Gesch. d. Theol. u. Kirche*, i. pp. 75 f.; and von Gebhardt's *Acta Mart. Selecta*, 1902, pp. 166 f.). The record of the martyrdom, which must be used with care and caution, is printed on pp. 171 f. of von Gebhardt's volume.

u. Unters., xi. 2. 44), Polyeuctes,[1] Maximilianus,[2] Marcellus,[3] Theodorus (Ruinart, pp. 506 f.: of Amasia

[1] Of the Melitene legion; cp. Conybeare's *Apol. and Acts of Apollonius* (1894), pp. 123 f.

[2] Cp. Ruinart, *op. cit.*, pp. 340 f. ("Theveste in foro" = Before the court at Theveste). "Fabius Victor temonarius est constitutus cum Valeriano Quintiano praeposito Caesariensi cum bono tirone Maximiliano filio Victoris; quoniam probabilis est, rogo ut incumetur. . . . Maximilianus respondit: Quid autem vis scire nomen meum? mihi non licet militare, quia Christianus sum. Dion proconsul dixit: apta illum. cumque aptaretur, Maximilianus respondit: non possum militare, non possum maleficere, Christianus sum. Dion proconsul dixit: Incumetur. cumque incumatus fuisset, ex officio recitatum est: Habet pedes quinque [quinos?], uncias decem [so that he was able-bodied]. Dion dixit ad officium: signetur. cumque resisteret Maximilianus, respondit: Non facio; non possum militare ['Fabius Victor, collector of the military exemption tax, was brought up with Valerianus Quintianus, prefect of Cæsarea, and with Maximilianus the son of Victor, a good recruit. As he is a likely man, I ask that he be measured.' . . . M. answered, 'But why do you want to know my name? I dare not fight, since I am a Christian.' 'Measure him,' said Dion the proconsul; but on being measured, M. answered, 'I cannot fight, I cannot commit a crime; I am a Christian.' Said the proconsul, 'Let him be measured.' And after he had been measured, the word came: he is five feet ten. Then said Dion to the attendants, 'Mark him.' And M. cried out, 'No, no, I cannot be a soldier']. See also what follows. "Milito deo meo"; "non accipio signaculum; iam habeo signum Christi dei mei. . . . si signaveris, rumpo illud, quia nihil valet. . . . non licet mihi plumbum collo portare post signum salutare domini mei" ("I am a soldier of my God. I refuse the mark. Already I have Christ's mark, who is my God. If you mark me, I shall annul it as invalid. . . . I cannot wear aught leaden on my neck after the saving mark of my Lord"). To the proconsul's question as to what crime soldiers practised, Maximilianus replied, "You know quite well what they do" ("tu enim scis quae faciunt").—Here we have a scene of forcible conscription.

[3] Cp. Ruinart, pp. 343 f. ("in civitate Tingitana"). On the emperor's birthday, when everybody was feasting and sacrificing, "Marcellus quidam ex centurionibus legionis Traianae. . . . reiecto

in Pontus), Tarachus,[1] Marcianus and Nicander,[2]

cingulo militari coram signis legionis, quae tunc aderant, clara voce testatus est, diceus: Jesu Christo regi aeterno milito. abjecit quoque vitem et arma et addidit: ex hoc militare imperatoribus vestris desisto et deos vestros ligneos et lapideos adorare contemno. si talis est condicio militantium, ut diis et imperatribus sacra facere compellantur, ecce proicio vitem et cingulum, renuntio signis, et militare recuso" ("A certain Marcellus, belonging to the centurions of the Trajan legion, put aside the military belt in front of the regimental standards, and testified in clear tones that he was a soldier of Jesus Christ, the king Eternal. He also put away the centurion's staff and arms, adding, 'Henceforth I cease to be a soldier of your emperors. I scorn to worship your gods of wood and stone. If it is a condition of military service to be obliged to do sacrifice to your gods and emperors, then hereby I throw off my staff and arms. I give up the colours, I refuse to be a soldier'"). When on trial, he added that it was unbecoming for a Christian who served his captain Christ, to serve in secular engagements ("non decebat Christianum hominem molestiis secularibus militare, qui Christo domino militat").

[1] Cp. Ruinart, pp. 451 f. When the judge asked what was his position, he replied: *στρατιωτικῆς . . . . διὰ δὲ τὸ Χριστιανόν με εἶναι νῦν παγανεύειν ᾑρετησάμην* ("That of a soldier . . . . But as I am a Christian, I now choose to wear ordinary dress"). To the further question, how he had ever gained his freedom, Tarachus replied: "I besought Fulvian the taxiarch, and he dismissed me" (*ἐδεήθην Φουλβίονος τοῦ ταξιάρχου, καὶ ἀπέλυσέ με*). He met the threats of the judge with the remark (p. 464): *εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματός μου, στρατιωτικὸν ὄντα οὕτως παρανόμως βασανίζειν* [cp. the rescript of Diocletian to Salustius], *πλὴν οὐ παραιτοῦμαί σου τὰς ἀπονοίας, πρᾶττε ὃ θέλεις* ("Though it were ever so unlawful for you to put my body to the torture, yet I do not deprecate your insensate breach of military law. Wreak your will on me").

[2] Cp. Ruinart, pp. 571 f. Upon the judge remonstrating that the emperor had ordered sacrifices, Nicander replies: "This injunction is designed for those who are willing to sacrifice. But we are Christians, and we cannot be bound by an injunction of this kind" ("Volentibus sacrificare haec praeceptio constituta est, nos vero Christiani sumus, et huiuscemodi praecepto teneri non

Dasius,[1] and the famous Pachomius,[2] etc., were all soldiers.

This representation of the relations between the church and military service might be contested on the basis of the twelfth canon of Nicæa, which runs as follows: "Those who are called by grace and have displayed early zeal and laid aside their military belts, but have subsequently turned back like a dog to his vomit—some even spending sums of money and securing military reinstation by dint of presents—

possumus"). To the further question as to why they would no longer draw their pay, Nicander answers, "Because the coin of the impious taints those who desire to worship God" ("Quia pecuniae impiorum contagium sunt viris deum colere cupientibus").

[1] Cp. *Analect. Bolland.*, xvi. (1897), pp. 11 f. Dasius declined to participate in the dissolute military celebration of the Saturnalia.

[2] Pachomius served (cp. his "Life") in the army of Constantine that fought Maxentius. He is said to have been brought over to Christianity by the brotherly love which the Christian soldiers showed. Therafter he became a monk, and the founder of the famous monastic settlement at Tabennisi.—The *Acta Archelai* open with a narrative in praise of Marcellus at Carrhæ. This wealthy Christian is said to have ransomed over 7700 military prisoners of war, an act which made a deep impression upon them. "Illi admirati et amplexi tam immensam viri pietatem munificentiamque et facti stupore permoti exemplo misericordiae commonentur, ut plurimi ex ipsis adderentur ad fidem domini nostri Jesu Christi *derelicto militiae cingulo*, alii vero vix quarta pretiorum portione suscepta ad propria castra discederent, caeteri autem parum omnino aliquid quantum viatico sufficeret accipientes abirent" ("Astounded with admiration for the man's extraordinary piety and generosity, which they enjoyed, and overcome by his example of humane kindness, the most of them were led to join the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *by casting away the military belt*; others made off to their own camp after little more than a fourth part of the money had been paid, while almost all the rest took as much as they needed for their journey, and departed"). The story is an invention, in all likelihood; still it is not without value.

these are to remain, after their three years as 'hearers,' for the space of ten years further among the 'kneelers,'" etc. It might be inferred from this that the synod considered Christianity incompatible with the military calling. But, on the other hand, as Hefele has rightly pointed out in the main (*Konzilien-Gesch.*, i.[2] pp. 414 f., Eng. trans., i. pp. 417 f.), the passage has nothing whatever to do with soldiers in general, but only with such soldiers as had resigned their position for the sake of their Christian confession and had subsequently gone back to the ranks. In the second place, the canon refers to soldiers serving in the army of Licinius, who had given up their military belts when the emperor purged the army of Christians (which is perhaps alluded to in the expression, *τὴν πρώτην ὁρμὴν ἐνδείξασθαι*), and then gone back to the army, thus denying their faith—since this army was practically pagan and engaged in combating Constantine. That this is the sense in which the canon is to be taken, is shown by its close connection with the eleventh canon, which treats of those who fell away *ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος* Λικινίου ("during the reign of Licinius"). Our canon fits in very closely to this one.

§ 4. *The spread of Christianity among women.*—Anyone who reads the New Testament attentively, as well as those writings which immediately succeeded it, cannot fail to notice that in the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages women played an important rôle in the propaganda of Christianity and throughout the Christian communities.

From 1 Cor. vii. 12 f. we learn that there were mixed marriages in Corinth, although it is impossible

to ascertain whether it was more usual for a pagan to be wedded to a Christian woman, or the reverse. It is quite clear, however, that women appeared in the local assemblies of the church, with the consent of the apostle, and that they prayed and prophesied in public (xi. 5 f.). This fact and this permission may seem to contradict the evidence of xiv. 34 f. ("Let the women keep silence in the congregations: for they are not allowed to speak, but are to be in subjection, as also the law enjoins. If they wish to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home, for it is a scandal that any woman should speak in the congregation") and, indeed, the one way of removing the contradiction between these two passages is to suppose that in the former Paul is referring to prayers and prophecies of the ecstatic state over which no one could exercise any control, while the speech (λαλεῖν) which is forbidden in the second passage denotes public instruction. At any rate the apostle is censuring Christian women for overstepping their bounds, not only by attempting to teach in the churches, but also by claiming to appear unveiled at worship.[1] In xvi. 19 Aquila and Prisca (Priscilla), together with the church in their house at Ephesus, send greetings. This passage already mentions the wife along with the husband (although after him), which is noteworthy, for as a rule the husband alone is mentioned in such cases. The woman must therefore have been of some importance personally and in the church at their

[1] Cp. Tertullian's *de virginibus velandis* (and the *Liber Pontif.*, s.v. Linus: "Hic ex praecepto beati Pauli constituit, ut mulier in ecclesia velato capite introiret" = This he ordained by the injunction of the blessed Paul, that women must come to church with veiled heads).

house, a fact on which some light is presently thrown by the epistle to the Romans.[1]

In Rom. xvi. 1 f. a certain Phœbe is commended, who is described as "one who ministers to the church at Cenchreæ." The subsequent description of her as one who "has proved herself a succourer of many and of myself" (προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ), renders it probable that she was a woman of property and a patroness (not an employee) of the church at Cenchreæ. This recommendation is followed by the charge to "greet Prisca and Aquila, my fellow-labourers in Christ Jesus—who laid down their necks for my life, and to whom not only I but all the Gentile churches render thanks. Greet also the church in their house" (Rom. xvi. 3 f.). Here the name of Prisca stands first, as also is the case, we may add, in 2 Tim. iv. 19. Plainly the woman was the leading figure of the two, so far as regards Christian activity at least. It is to her that thanks and praise are offered in the first instance. She was a fellow-labourer of Paul, *i.e.* a missionary and at the same time the leader of a small church, and both of these injunctions imply that she taught. Nor could she take part in missionary work and in teaching, unless she had been inspired and set apart by the Spirit. Otherwise Paul would not have recognized her. She may be claimed as ἡ ἀπόστολος, therefore, although Paul has not given her this title. Further greetings in Rom. xvi. (6) are addressed to

[1] In 1 Cor. i. 11 Paul mentions οἱ τῆς Χλόης, who brought him special information about the state of matters in the Corinthian church; but we do not know if Chloe was herself a Christian, nor can we tell where to look for her.

a certain Mary ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς, to Tryphena and Tryphosa τὰς κοπιούσας ἐν κυρίῳ (12), to Persis ἡ ἀγαπητή, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ (12), to the mother of Rufus, whom Paul also describes as his own mother (13), to Julias, probably the wife of the Philologus with whom she is mentioned (15), and to the sister of Nereus (15). Thus no fewer than fifteen women are saluted, alongside of eighteen men,[1] and all these must have rendered important services to the church or to the apostle, or to both, in the shape of the work which is here noted to their credit.[2]

From Col. iv. 15 we learn that there was a conventicle at Colossê, presided over by a woman called Nymphê; for it was in her house that the meetings took place.[3]

In Philippians, which contains so few personal items, we read (iv. 2): "I exhort Euodia and I exhort Syntychê to be of the same mind in the Lord. Yea, I pray thee also, true yokefellow, to help these women, for they have wrought with me in the service of the gospel, together with Clement and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the Book of

[1] Counting Junias, next to Andronicus (xvi. 7), as a man. Chrysostom, however, took the name as feminine (= Junia).

[2] The overwhelming probability is that Pomponia Græcina, the "distinguished lady" ("insignis femina") of Rome in the apostolic age (Tacit., *Annal.*, xiii. 32), was also a Christian, but this question has been so frequently fully discussed that it needs no further investigation.

[3] Ἀσπάσασθε . . . . Νυμφᾶν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν. In the note to Philemon, whose destination was also Colossê, Philemon's wife Apphia is mentioned (but no more) along with himself in the opening address, as the note referred to a domestic affair in which the mistress of the household also had some say.

life." These two women, then, had helped to found the church at Philippi, and consequently occupied a position of high honour still (perhaps as presidents of two churches in their houses, like Nymphê at Colossê). They had at present fallen into dissension, and the apostle is careful to avoid siding with either party. He would have them find the right road themselves, with the further aid of the husband of one of them (*i.e.* of Syntychê)—the other being perhaps a widow, or married to a pagan, or unmarried. The affair would certainly have never been mentioned in the epistle, had it not been of moment to the whole community.

Both in Col. iii. 18 and in Eph. v. 22 the apostle insists that wives are to be subject to their husbands, and the redoubled injunction becomes intelligible when we observe how natural it was for Christian women to strike out on a line of their own.

The book of Acts fills up the outline sketched by Paul. In the church of Jerusalem (i. 14) Christian women were already to the front; a daily meeting was held at night in the house of Mary the mother of Mark. The accession of women as well as of men to the church is expressly noted (v. 14). We hear of Tabitha at Joppa (ix. 36 f.), of Lydia at Philippi,[1] the first Christian woman we know of in Europe (xvi. 14), of Damaris at Athens side by side with Dionysius (xvii. 34), of the four daughters of Philip who were prophetesses (xxi. 9), and of the special share taken

[1] Three women, therefore, took part in the founding of the church at Philippi—Lydia, Euodia, and Syntychê. Lydia, however, may be a cognomen, in which case she might be identified with either Euodia or Syntychê.

by women of the Diaspora in the new movement (xiii. 50, at Antioch of Pisidia, *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας τὰς εὐσχήμονας καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως*: xvii. 4, at Thessalonica, *προσεκληρώθησαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλᾳ, τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγοι*: xvii. 12, at Berœa, *πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων καὶ ἀνδρῶν* [note the precedence of the women] *οὐκ ὀλίγοι*). Priscilla also is adduced, and adduced in a way that corresponds entirely with what Paul tells us. She and her husband[1] stand independently alongside of Paul (xviii. 2 f.). At Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, they carry on a mission work in combination with him but by virtue of their own authority. Yet in Acts also (xviii. 18, 26) the woman is first, and it was the woman who—as Chrysostom truly infers from xviii. 26—converted Apollos, the disciple of John the Baptist. As the latter was a cultured Greek, the woman who was capable of instructing him (*ἀκριβέστερον ἐκθεῖναι τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*) must have been herself a person of some culture. She was not merely the mother of a church in her house. As we find from Paul as well, she was a missionary and a teacher.

In First Peter, women are exhorted likewise to be submissive to their husbands, but a special motive for this is appended (iii. 1): *ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν*. Unbelieving husbands are to be converted by the

[1] Aquila alone is described as a Jew from Pontus. Does this mean that his wife was of other and higher origin? Cp. my study on the couple in the *Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissen.*, 1900, pp. 2 f.

behaviour of their wives, not by sermons and instruction from them. This presupposes mixed marriages, in which it was the women who were Christians.

In the Apocalypse we hear of a Christian, though heretical, prophetess at Thyatira, called Jezebel, who seduced the church. Which tacitly presupposes that women could be, and actually were, prophetesses.[1]

After staying some time at Smyrna, in the course of his journey to Rome, Ignatius sends greetings in the two letters which he addressed to the local church (*ad Smyrn.*, *ad Polyc.*) from Troas—letters which otherwise contain very few greetings indeed—to a certain Alkê, τὸ ποθητόν μοι ὄνομα ("a name right dear to me"); in one letter he also salutes "the household of Gabia, praying that she may be grounded in faith and love" (τὸν οἶκον Γαουΐας, ἣν εὔχομαι ἑδρᾶσθαι πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ), while in the other he sends greetings to τὴν τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου [so I read, following what seems to me to be a probable conjecture of Lightfoot instead of Ἐπιτρόπου] σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν τέκνων [τοῖς τέκνοις?] ("the wife of the governor, with all her household and her children's [her children?]"). There is something very attractive, too, in Lightfoot's further conjecture that Gabia is to be identified with the wife of the procurator ("mention is made in the inscription at Smyrna of an officer called ἐπίτροπος στρατηγός or ἐπίτροπος τῆς στρατηγίας; another Smyrnæan inscription speaks of ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, see Boeck, *C. J.* 3151, 3162, 3203"). This would make the procurator's wife Gabia a Christian, while he himself was a pagan (a typical case, to which we are able to

[1] In Heb. xi. women are also presented as heroines of the faith. The epistle was perhaps composed by Priscilla or by Aquila.

bring forward many a parallel). It would also give her a prominent position in the church. Such a position, and in fact even a more prominent one, must have been also occupied by Alkê, nor was her case quite by itself. In the epistle of the Smyrnæans upon the death of Polycarp (c. xvii.), we read of an opponent of the Christians, called Nicetas, who was "Alkê's brother," a description which would be meaningless if Alkê herself had not been a very prominent lady not only in Smyrna but also in Philomelium (to which the epistle is addressed). Both of these passages from Ignatius, in short, throw light upon the fact that she was a Christian of especial influence and energy in Smyrna, and that her character was familiar throughout Asia. By the year 115 A.D. she was already labouring for the church, and as late as 150 A.D. she was still well known and apparently still living. Her brother was an energetic foe to Christianity, while she herself was a pillar of the church. And so it was with Gabia. In both cases the men were pagans, the women Christians.

A prominent position in some unknown church of Asia must also have been occupied by the woman to whom the second epistle of John was written, not long before the letters of Ignatius. She appears to have been distinguished for exceptional hospitality, and the author therefore warns her in a friendly way against receiving heretical itinerant teachers into her house.

The reaction initiated by Paul at Corinth against the forward position claimed by women in the churches, is carried on by the author of the pastoral

epistles.[1] In 1 Tim. ii. 11 f. he peremptorily prohibits women from teaching.[2] Let them bear children and maintain faith, love, and holiness. The reason for this is explicitly stated; it is because they are inferior to men. Adam was first formed, then Eve. It was Eve, not Adam, who was seduced by the serpent.[3] These sharp words presuppose serious encroachments on the part of Christian women, and already there had been unpleasant experiences with indolent, lascivious, and gossiping young widows (*op. cit.*, v. 11 f.). As 2 Tim. iii. 6 shows, it was specially common for such women to succumb to the seductions of fascinating errorists.

One fresh feature in the pastoral epistles is that the existence of a class of ecclesiastical "widows" is taken for granted, and in this connection special

[1] Also by an earlier editor of Acts; cp. my remarks, *op. cit.*, p. 10, note 5. Probably Clement of Rome is also to be included in this category. His exhortations to women (*Clem. Rom.*, i. xxi.) are designed to restrict them within their households, and the same holds true of Polycarp (*ad Phil.* iv.). In the "Shepherd" of Hermas, women play no part whatsoever, which leads us to assume that they had fallen more into the background at Rome than elsewhere.

[2] Διδάσκειν γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. This seems to conflict with Tit. ii. 3, where it is enjoined that πρεσβύτιδας εἶναι . . . . καλοδιδασκάλους. We must take in the next clause, however (ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας φιλάνδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους, κ.τ.λ.), which shows that the writer does not mean teaching in the church.

[3] This voiced an idea which operated still further and was destined to prove disastrous to the Catholic church. Tertullian already writes thus (*de cultu femin.*, I. i.): "Evam te esse nescis? vivit sententia dei super sexum istum in hoc seculo: vivat et reatus necesse est. tu es diaboli janua, tu es arboris illius resignatrix, tu es divinae legis prima desertrix, tu es quae eum suasisti quem diabolus aggredi non valuit. tu imaginem dei, hominem, tam facile elisisti. propter tuum meritum, id est mortem, etiam filius dei

instructions are laid down (1 Tim. v. 9 f.). Pliny's letter to Trajan mentions Christian women who were called by their fellow-members "deaconesses" (ministrae), and there was also an order of regular female ascetics or "virgines," who are perhaps referred to as early as 1 Cor. vii. 36 f. The original relation between the church-widow, the deaconess (unknown in the Western church), and the "virgin," lies in obscurity, but such directions show at any rate that ecclesiastical regulations for women were drawn up at a very early period.

In the romantic but early *Acta Pauli*, women also played a prominent rôle. We are told of a prophetess in the church of Corinth, called Theonoê[1] of Stratonikê (the wife of Apollophanes) at Philippi (who is thus the fourth woman mentioned by tradition in connection with that city), of Artemilla at Ephesus, and

mori habuit" ("Do you not know you are an Eve? God's verdict on the sex still holds good, and the sex's guilt must still hold also. *You are the devil's gateway.* You are the avenue to that forbidden tree. You are the first deserter from the law divine. It was you who persuaded him whom the devil himself had not strength to assail. So lightly did you destroy God's image. For your deceit, for death, the very Son of God had to perish"). The figure of Mary the mother of Jesus rose all the more brilliantly as a foil to this. The wrong done, in this view, to the whole sex, was to be made good by the adoration paid to Mary. But it must not be forgotten, *à propos* of Tertullian's revolting language, that his rhetoric frequently runs away with him. Elsewhere in the same book (II. i.) he writes: "Ancillae dei vivi, conservae et sorores meae, quo iure deputor vobiscum postremissimus equidem, eo iure conservitii et fraternitatis audeo ad vos facere sermonem" ("O handmaidens of the living God, my fellow-servants and sisters, the law that sets me, most unworthy, in your ranks, emboldens me as your fellow-servant to address you").

[1] So the Coptic text.

above all of the "apostle" Thecla at Iconium.[1] We are told that Thecla baptized herself, and that she proceeded to labour and to die as a missionary, "after enlightening many with the word of God" (πολλοὺς φωτίσασα τῷ λόγῳ θεοῦ). It is unlikely that the romancer simply invented this figure. There must have really been a girl converted by Paul at Iconium, whose name was Thecla, and who took an active part in the Christian mission. As for the later apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, they simply swarm with tales of how women of all ranks were converted in Rome and in the provinces; and although the details of these stories are untrustworthy, they express correctly enough in general the truth that Christian preaching was laid hold of by women in particular, as also that the percentage of Christian women, especially among the upper classes, was larger than that of Christian men. "Both sexes" ("utrius sexus") are emphasized as early as Pliny's letter, and other opponents of the faith laid stress upon the fact that Christian preaching was specially acceptable to widows and to wives.[2] This is further attested by the apologists, who have a penchant for bringing out the fact that the very Christian women, on account of whom Christianity is vilified as an inferior religion, are better acquainted with divine things than the philosophers.[3]

[1] Besides Lectra, Theocleia, Tryphæna, and Falconilla.

[2] Cp. Celsus in Orig., *c. Cels.*, III. xliv. Porphyry, too, still held this view (cp. Jerome, *in Isai.* 3, *Brev. in Psalt.* 82, and August., *de civit. dei,* XIX. xxiii.). The woman whom Apuleius describes as abominable (*Metam.*, ix. 14), seems to have been a Christian [see vol. i. p. 265].

[3] So still Augustine, *e.g.*, *de civit dei,* X. ii.: "Difficile fuit tanto philosopho [sc. Porphyry] cunctam diabolicam societatem vel nosse

Even after the middle of the second century women are still prominent, not only for their number and position as widows and deaconesses in the service of the church,[1] but also as prophetesses and teachers. The author of the *Acta Theclae* is quite in love with his Thecla. It never occurs to him to object to her as a teacher. He rather extols her, and his view even of the prophetess at Corinth has no element of blame in it. As we know from Tertullian that this author was a presbyter of Asia Minor, it follows that there were even ecclesiastics about the middle of the second century who did not disapprove of women teaching and doing missionary work.

At Hierapolis in Phrygia the prophetic daughters of Philip enjoyed great esteem; Papias, amongst others, listened to their words. Not long after them there lived an Asiatic prophetess called Ammia, whose name was still mentioned with respect at the close of the second century (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 17). The great Montanist movement in Phrygia, during the sixth decade of the second century, was evoked by the labours of Montanus and two prophetesses called

vel fidenter arguere, quam quaelibet anicula Christiana nec cunctatur esse et liberrime detestatur" ("Hard was it for so great a philosopher to understand or confidently to assail the whole fraternity of devils, which any Christian old woman would unhesitatingly describe and loathe with the utmost freedom"). Women were also among the pupils of apologists and teachers, as is often noticed in the case of Origen. A woman called Charito belonged to the group of Justin's pupils (*Acta Justini*, iv.).

[1] I refrain from entering into details regarding the services of women in the church, as we shall soon get a thorough study of this subject from a young scholar, my friend and pupil, Herr Zscharnack [since published under the title of *Der Dienst der Frau in d. ersten Jahrh. der christ. Kirche*, 1903].

Maximilla and Priscilla.[1] Later on, a prophetess known as Quintilla seems to have made her appearance in the same district,[2] while during the reign of Maximinus Thrax a certain prophetess caused a sensation in Cappadocia (cp. Firmilian, in Cypr., *ep.* lxxv. 10).

Among the gnostics especially[3] women played a great rôle, for the gnostic looked not to sex but to the Spirit. Marcion was surrounded by "sanctiores feminas."[4] Apelles in Rome listened to the revelation of a virgin called Philumena (Tert., *de praescr.* xxx., etc.) Marcellina, the Carpocratian, came to Rome, and taught there.[5] Marcus, the pupil of Valentinus and the founder of his sect, had a special number of women among his adherents, whom he even made pronounce the benediction, and consecrated as prophetesses, thereby leading many astray in Gaul.[6]

[1] Tertullian (*de anima,* ix.) writes: "We have with us a sister who has had a share in the spiritual gifts of revelation. For in church, during the Sabbath worship, she undergoes ecstasies. She converses with angels, at times even with the Lord himself; she sees and hears mysteries, pierces the hearts of several people, and suggests remedies to those who desire them." From *Apost. Constit.* (cp. *Texte u. Unters.,* v. part 5, p. 22) it is plain that in the case of the church-widows special endowments of grace were looked for, through the Spirit.

[2] Epiph., *Hær.* xlix. But the personality is hazy.

[3] Leaving out of account, of course, the Helena of Simon Magus.

[4] Jerome, *ep.* xliii. In his letter to Ctesiphon (see also on 2 Tim. iii. 6) he writes that "Marcion dispatched a woman on before him to Rome, in order to prepare the minds of people for the reception of his own errors" ("Marcion Romam praemisit mulierem quae decipiendos sibi animos praepararet").

[5] *Iren.,* i. 25: "Multos exterminavit" (many she led away).

[6] *Iren.,* i. 13. 2: γυναῖκας εὐχαριστεῖν ἐγκελεύεται παρεστῶτος αὐτοῦ . . . . μάλιστα περὶ γυναῖκας ἀσχολεῖται, καὶ τοῦτο τὰς εὐπαρύφους καὶ

And in general the women who belonged to the heretical societies are described by Tertullian as follows (*de praescr.* xli.): "Ipsae mulieres haereticae, quam procaces! quae audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan et tingere" ("The very women of the heretics—how forward they are! Venturing to teach, to debate, to exorcise, to promise cures, probably even to baptize").

It was by her very opposition offered to gnosticism and Montanism that the church was led to interdict women from any activity within the church—apart, of course, from such services as they rendered to those of their own sex. Tertullian's treatise upon baptism (*de baptismo*) was called forth by the arrival at Carthage of a heretical woman who taught and in her teaching disparaged baptism. In commencing his argument, Tertullian observes that even had her teaching been sound, she ought not to have been a teacher. He then proceeds to attack those members of the church (for evidently there were such) who appealed to the case of Thecla in defending the right of women to teach and to baptize. First of all, he deprives them of their authority; their Acts he declares are a forgery. Then he refers to 1 Cor. xiv. 34 to prove that a woman must keep silence. Even as a Montanist, it is to be noted that Tertullian adhered to this position. "Non permittitur mulieri

περιπορφύρους καὶ πλουσιωτάτας ("He bids women give thanks even in his presence . . . . he is most concerned about women, and that, too, women of rank and position and wealth"), i. 13. 7: ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς κλίμασι τῆς Ῥοδανουσίας πολλὰς ἐξηπατήκασι γυναῖκας ("In our district of the Rhone they have deluded many women"). On the compulsory consecration of women to the prophetic office, till they actually felt they were prophetesses, see i. 13. 3.

in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi vindicare" (*de virg. vel.* ix.)[1] Even the female visionary in the Montanist church did not speak "till the ceremonies were done and the people dismissed" ("post transacta solemnia dimissa plebe," *de anima* ix.).

Nevertheless women still continued to play a part in some of the subsequent movements throughout the church. Thus a sempstress in Carthage, called Paula, had to be excommunicated for agitating against Cyprian (*ep.* xlii.), whilst "that factious woman" ("factiosa femina") Lucilla was also responsible for poisoning the Carthaginian church with the Donatist controversy at the very outset (Optatus, i. 16).

The number of prominent women who are described as either Christians themselves or favourably disposed to Christianity is extremely large.[2] In addition to

[1] "No woman is allowed to speak in church, or even to teach, or baptize, or discharge any man's function, much less to take upon herself the priestly office." Tertullian frequently discusses the Christian problem of women in his writings; it occasioned many difficulties. Obviously at the bottom of the legend of the so-called "Apostolic Constitutions" on Martha and Mary—a legend which is dominated by conscious purpose — there lies the question whether or no any active part is to be assigned to women in the celebration of the Lord's supper (cp. *Texte u. Unters.*, ii. 5. (p. 28 f.): ὅτε ᾔτησεν ὁ διδάσκαλος τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον καὶ ηὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου καὶ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἐπέτρεψε ταῖς γυναιξὶ συστῆναι ἡμῖν ("When the Lord asked for the bread and the cup and blessed them, saying, This is my body and my blood, he did not bid women associate themselves with us.").

[2] From Tertullian's teatise *de cultu feminarum*, as well as from the *Paedagogus* of Clement, it becomes still more obvious that there were a considerable number of distinguished and wealthy women

those already mentioned, mention may be made especially of Domitilla, the wife of T. Flavius Clemens; of Marcia, of Julia Mammæa, of the consort of Philip the Arabian, of the distinguished Roman martyr Soter (of whom Ambrose was proud to be a relative), of the sisters Victoria, Secunda, and Restituta (who belonged to a senatorial family in Carthage), of the wife and daughter of the emperor Diocletian, of St Crispina "most noble and highly born" ("clarissima, nobilis genere"). Tertullian (*ad Scap.* iv., etc.) speaks of "clarissimae feminae," and Christian "matrons," who were to be exiled, are mentioned in the second edict of Valerian. Origen emphasizes the fact that even titled ladies, wives of high state-officials, embraced Christianity (*c. Cels.*, III. ix.). The story of Pilate's wife, who warned him against condemning Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 19), may be a legend, but it was typical in after-days of many an authentic case of the kind. Tertullian tells us how "Claudius Lucius Herminianus in Cappadocia

in the churches of Carthage and Alexandria. In the second book (c. i.) of the former work Tertullian declares that many Christian women dressed and went about just like "women of the world" ("feminae nationum"). There were even women who defended their finery and display on the ground that they would attract attention as Christians if they did not dress like other people (II. xi.) To which Tertullian replies (xiii.): "Ceterum nescio an manus spatalio circumdari solita in duritiam catenae stupescere sustineat. nescio an crus periscelio laetatum in nervum se patiatur artari. timeo cervicem, ne margaritarum et smaragdorum laqueis occupata locum spathae non det" ("Else I know not if the wrist, accustomed to be circled with a palmleaf bracelet, will endure the numb, hard chain. I know not if the ankle that has delighted in the anklet will bear the pressure of the gyves. I fear that the neck roped with pearls and emeralds will have no room for the sword").

treated the Christians cruelly, in hot anger at his wife having gone over to this sect" ("Claudius L. H. in Cappadocia indigne ferens uxorem suam ad hanc sectam transisse Christianos crudeliter tractavit," *ad Scap.* iii.). Hippolytus narrates how some Christians who had gone out into the desert in an apocalyptic frenzy, would have been executed as robbers by a Syrian governor, had not his wife, being a believer (οὖσα πιστή), interceded on their behalf (*Comm. in Dan.*, iv. 18). Eusebius has preserved for us the story of the Christian wife of the prefect of Rome under Maxentius (*H.E.*, viii. 14), who, like a second Lucretia, committed suicide in order to avoid dishonour. And Justin (*Apol.*, II. ii.) tells of a distinguished Roman lady who had herself divorced from a licentious husband. In all these cases the husband was a pagan, while the wife was a Christian.[1]

[1] Cp. also *Mart. Saturn. et Dativi* (Ruinart, p. 417): "Fortunatianus, sanctissimae martyris Victoriae frater, vir sane togatus, sed a religionis Christianae . . . . cultu . . . . alienus" ("F., the brother of that most holy martyr, Victoria, was indeed a Roman citizen, but he was far from sharing in the worship of Christian religion"). In Porphyry's treatise, ἡ ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφία (cp. Aug., *de civit dei*, xix. 23), an oracle of Apollo is cited, which had been vouchsafed to a man who asked the god how to reclaim his wife from Christianity: "Forte magis poteris in aqua impressis litteris scribere aut adinflans leves pinnas per aera avis volare, quam pollutae revoces impiae uxoris sensum. pergat quo modo vult inanibus fallaciis perseverans et lamentari fallaciis mortuum deum cantans, quem iudicibus recta sentientibus perditum pessima in speciosis ferro vincta mors interfecit" ("Probably you could more easily write on water or manage to fly on wings through the air like a bird, than win back to a right feeling the mind of your polluted impious spouse. Let her go where she pleases, sticking to her idle deceptions and singing false laments to her dead god, who was condemned by right-minded judges and who perished most

Neither in the pre-Decian period nor in subsequent years was there any difference made between men and women in a persecution. This is one of the best-established facts in the history of early Christianity. Consequently the number of female martyrs was, comparatively speaking, very large. Thecla passed as the first of these, though it was said that she was miraculously preserved. After her, in the ranks of women martyrs, were reckoned Domitilla and Agnes in Rome, Blandina in Lyons, Agathonicê in Pergamum, Donata, Secunda, and Vesta at Scili, Potamiæna, Quinta, Apollonia, Ammonarion, Mercuria, and Dionysia in Alexandria, Perpetua and Felicitas at Carthage, Dionysia in Lampsacus, Domnina [Donuina] and Theonilla[1] in Aegea, Eulalia in Spain, and Afra in Augsburg. But it would lead us too far afield to enumerate even the women of whom we have authentic information as having suffered martyrdom or exile, or having abandoned lives of vice. They displayed no less degree of fortitude and heroism than did the men, nor did the church expect from them any inferior

ignominiously by a violent death"). The difficulties met by a Christian woman with a pagan husband are dramatically put by Tertullian, *ad uxor.*, ii. 4 f. (partly quoted above, vol. i. pp. 479 f.). Cases in which the husband was a Christian, while his wife was pagan, or nominally Christian, must have been infrequent; cp., however, the *Acta Marciani et Nicandri* and the *Acta Irenaei* (above, vol. i. pp. 492 f.).

[1] Theonilla (Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, p. 311) describes herself as a "woman of good birth" ("ingenua mulier"). When she had to let herself be stripped before the magistrate, she declared, "Thou hast put shame not on me alone, but through me, on thine own mother and thy wife" ("non me solam, sed et matrem tuam et uxorem confusionem induisti per me").

response. In her commemoration of the martyrs, she even reckoned these triumphant women worthy of double honour.

In the last persecution (that of Licinius) another extremely remarkable prohibition was put in force, relating to women. The emperor decreed that (1) men and women were not to worship together; that (2) women were never to enter places of worship; and (3) that women were to be taught religion by women only, instead of by bishops (Euseb., *Vita Const.*, 1. liii.). The reasons for these orders (which were "generally derided") remain obscure. Concern for feminine morality cannot have been anything but a pretext. But what then, it may be asked, was their real motive? Are we at liberty to infer from the decree that the emperor considered Christianity derived its strength from women?

It remains to say something about the mixed marriages, which Paul had discussed at an earlier period (see above, pp. 217 f.). The apostle did not desire their dissolution. On the contrary, he directed the Christian spouse to adhere to the union and to hope for the conversion of the pagan partner. But Paul was certainly assuming that the marriage was already consummated by the time that one of the partners became a Christian.[1] Not until a com-

[1] It is a moot point whether 1 Cor. vii. 39 (μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ) definitely excludes the marriage of a Christian woman with a pagan. Despite Tertullian's opinion and the weighty support of those exegetes who advocate this interpretation, I am unable to agree with it. Had the apostle desired to exclude such unions, he would have said so explicitly, I imagine, and referred to the case of a husband as well as of a wife. Or can it be that he is merely forbidding a Christian woman to marry a pagan, and not forbidding

paratively late period do we hear of marriages being concluded between Christians and pagans.[1] At first, and for some time to come, these unions were never formed at all, or formed extremely seldom; but often by the close of the second century it was no longer an unheard-of thing for such mixed marriages to take place. Tertullian wrote the whole of the second book in his treatise *ad uxorem* in order to warn his wife against marrying a pagan, if she became a widow; and in the first and second chapters he expressly states that such unions were being consummated. He not merely looks askance at them, but most severely reprobates them ("fideles gentilium matrimonia subeuntes stupri reos esse constat et arcendos ab omni communicatione fraternitatis," iii).[2] To his sorrow, however, he has to record the recent utterance of one brother, who maintained that while marriage with a pagan was certainly an offence, it was a very trivial offence.

a Christian man to choose a pagan girl? This is not impossible, and yet such an issue is improbable. The *μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ* ("only in the Lord") means that the Christian standpoint of the married person is to be maintained, but this could be preserved intact even in the case of marriage with a pagan (cp. vii. 16). Besides, the presupposition naturally is that the Christian partner is desirous and capable of winning over the pagan.

[1] Ignatius (*ad Polyc.*, v.) gives a decision in the matter of divorce, but clearly he is only thinking of marriages in which both parties are Christians. No other cases seem to have come under his notice.

[2] "It is agreed that believers who marry pagans are guilty of fornication, and are to be excluded from any intercourse with the brotherhood"; cp. *de corona* xiii.: "Ideo non nubemus ethnicis, ne nos ad idololatriam usque deducant, a qua apud illos nuptiae incipiunt" ("Therefore we do not marry pagans, lest they lead us astray into that idolatry which is the very starting-point of their nuptials"). The allusion is to the pagan ceremonies at a wedding.

On this subject the church was at first inclined to side with the rigorists. In his *Testimonia*, Cyprian devotes a special section (iii. 62) to the rule that "no marriage-tie is to be formed with pagans" ("matrimonium cum gentilibus non iungendum"),[1] while it was ordained at the synod of Elvira (canon xv.) that "because Christian maidens are very numerous, they are by no means to be married off to pagans, lest their youthful prime presume and relax into an adultery of the soul" ("propter copiam puellarum gentilibus minime in matrimonium dandae sunt virgines Christianae, ne aetas in flore tumens in adulterium animae resolvatur"). See also canons xvi. and xvii. ("If heretics are unwilling to come over to the Catholic church, they are not to be allowed to marry Catholic girls. Resolved also, that neither Jews nor heretics be allowed to marry such, since there can be no fellowship between a believer and an unbeliever. Any parents who disobey this interdict shall be excluded from the church for five years" ("Haeretici si se transferre noluerint ad ecclesiam catholicam, ne ipsis catholicas dandas esse puellas; sed neque Judaeis neque haereticis dare placuit, eo quod nulla possit esse societas fideli cum infidele: si contra interdictum

[1] The passage in *de lapsis* vi. is evidence, of course, that the church could not always interfere; at any rate she did not instantly excommunicate offenders. In the gloomy picture drawn by Cyprian (*de lapsis* vi.) of the condition of the Carthaginian church before the Decian persecution, mixed marriages do not fail to form one feature of the situation ("Jungere cum infidelibus vinculum matrimonii, prostituere gentilibus membra Christi" = Matrimonial ties are formed with unbelievers, and Christ's members prostituted to the pagans).

fecerint parentes, abstineri per quinquennium placet"). "Should any parents have married their daughters to heathen priests, resolved that they shall never be granted communion" ("Si qui forte sacerdotibus idolorum filias suas iunxerint, placuit nec in finem eis dandam esse communionem").[1]

"Because Christian girls are very numerous" ("propter copiam puellarum"). This implies that girls, especially of good position, outnumbered youths in the Christian communities. Hence Tertullian had already advised Christian girls who possessed property to marry poor young men (*ad uxor.*, II. viii.). Why, he exclaims, many a pagan woman gives her hand to some freedman or slave, in defiance of public opinion, so long as she can get a husband from whom she need not fear any check upon her loose behaviour! These words were in all probability read by Callistus, the Roman bishop; for even in Rome there must have been a great risk of Christian girls, in good positions, either marrying pagans or forming illicit connections with them, when they could not find any Christian man of their own rank, and when they were unwilling to lose caste by marrying any Christian beneath them. Consequently Callistus declared that he would allow such women to take a slave or free man, without concluding a legal marriage with him. Such sexual unions he would be willing (for ecclesiastical considerations) to recognize (Hipp.,

[1] At the synod of Arles (which really does not belong, however, to our period) the church had already become more lenient than at Elvira; cp. canon xi.: "De puellis fidelibus, qui gentilibus iunguntur, placuit, ut aliquanto tempore a communione separentur" ("Concerning Christian maidens who have married pagans. Resolved, that they be excluded from communion for a certain period").

Philos., ix. 12; cp. above, vol. i. pp. 211–212). The church thus created an ecclesiastical law of marriage[1] as opposed to the civil, and she did so under the constraint of circumstances. These circumstances of the situation in which she saw herself placed, arose from the fact of Christian girls within the church outnumbering the youths, the indulgence of Callistus itself proving unmistakably that the female element in the church, so far as the better classes were concerned, was in the majority.

[1] Hippolytus notices the untoward results of this extremely questionable dispensation.

CHAPTER III.

THE EXTENSION OF CHRISTIANITY DOWN TO 325 A.D.

In this chapter I shall adhere strictly to the limits indicated by the title, excluding any place which cannot actually be verified until after 325 A.D. Owing to the fortuitous character of the traditions at our disposal, it is indubitable that many, indeed very many, places at which it is impossible to *prove* that a Christian community existed previous to the council of Nicæa, may nevertheless have contained such a community, and even a bishopric, although no one can tell with any certainty what such places were. Besides, although unquestionably the age of Constantine was not an era, so far as regards the East, during which a very large number of new bishoprics were created—since in not a few provinces the network of the ecclesiastical hierarchy appears to have been already knit so fast and firm that what was required was not the addition of new meshes but actually, in several cases, the removal of one or two[1]

[1] I should take it as incontrovertible, with regard to the provinces of Asia Minor, that the network there was firm and fast by the time of Constantine. There were about four hundred local bishoprics by the end of the fourth century, so that if we can prove, despite the scantiness and fortuitous nature of the sources, close upon one hundred and fifty for the period before 325 A.D., it

—despite all this, it is certain that a large number of new Christian communities did come then into being. In the West a very large number of bishoprics, as well as of churches, were founded during the fourth century, and the Christianizing of not a few provinces now commenced upon a serious scale (cp. Sulp. Severus, *Chron.*, ii. 33: "Hoc temporum tractu mirum est quantum invaluerit religio Christiana" = during this period the Christian religion increased at an astonishing rate). As for the extent to which Christianity spread throughout the various provinces, while the following pages will exhibit all that really can be stated on this point, no evidence available upon the number of the individual churches (or bishoprics) would render it feasible to draw up any accurate outline of the general situation, inasmuch as our information is superior regarding some provinces, inferior in quantity as regards others, and first-rate as regards none. Had I drawn the limit at 381 A.D., or even at 343 A.D., a much more complete conspectus could be furnished. But in that case we would have had to abandon our self-imposed task of determining how far Christianity had spread by the time that Constantine extended to it toleration and special privileges.[1] For the purpose of surveying the localities where Christian communities can be proved

becomes highly probable that the majority of these four hundred were in existence by that time. This calculation is corroborated by the fact that during the fourth century Asia Minor yields evidence of the chor-episcopate being vigorously repressed and dissolved, but rarely of new bishoprics being founded.

[1] One of the most important aids to this task is the list of signatures to the council of Nicæa in 325 A.D., an excellent critical edition of which has recently appeared (*Patrum Nicaenorum nomina*

to have existed before 325 A.D., I shall begin by presenting two lists which give the places where there were Christian communities before Trajan (or Commodus).[1]

I. Places in which Christian communities or Christians can be traced as early as the first century (previous to Trajan).[2]

latine, graece, coptice, syriace, arabice, armeniace, by H. Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, and O. Cunitz; Leipzig, 1898; see also the edition by C. H. Turner, Oxford, 1899). The number of bishops in attendance at Nicæa (which, according to Eusebius, our best witness, exceeded two hundred and fifty) gives no clue to the spread of the episcopate, let alone the Christian religion, for extremely few bishops were present from Europe and North Africa, and a large number even from the East failed to put in an appearance. The assertion made by the Eastern sources that over two thousand clergy were present, is credible, but immaterial.—Cumont's remark upon the Christian inscriptions of the East is unfortunately to the point: "Je ne sais s'il existe une catégorie de textes épigraphiques, qui soit plus mal connue aujourd'hui que les inscriptions chrétiennes de l'empire d'Orient" (*Les Inscr. chrét. de l'Asie mineure,* Rome, 1895, p. 5).

[1] I content myself with a mere enumeration, as the subsequent section, arranged according to provinces, gives a sketch of the spread and increase of Christianity in the respective provinces. In this chapter I have not entered, of course, into the special details of the history of this spread throughout the provinces, a task for which we need the combined labours of specialists, archæologists and architects, while every large province requires a staff of scholars to itself, such as North Africa has found among the French savants. This will remain for years, no doubt, a pious hope. Yet even the investigations conducted by individuals has already done splendid service for the history of provincial and local churches in antiquity. Beside de Rossi stand Le Blant and Ramsay. The modest pages which follow, and which I almost hesitate to publish, will serve their purpose if they provide a sketch of the general contour, which is accurate in its essential features.

[2] Note how not only Acts but also Paul at an earlier period groups together the Christians of individual provinces, showing that

Jerusalem.
Damascus (Acts ix.).
Samaria (Acts viii. ; also Samaritan villages, ver. 25).
Lydda (Acts ix.).
Joppa (Acts ix.).
Saron (Acts ix.).
Cæsarea-Palest. (Acts x.).
Antioch in Syria (Acts xi., etc.).
Tyre (Acts xxi.).
Sidon (Acts xxvii.).
Ptolemais (Acts xxi.).
Pella[1] (Eus., *H.E.*, III. v. ; for other Palestinian localities where even at an early period Jewish Christians resided, see under III. i., Palestina).
Tarsus (Acts ix., xi., xv.).
Salamis in Cyprus (Acts xiii.).
Paphos in Cyprus (Acts xiii.).
Perga in Pamphylia (Acts xiii., xiv.).
Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiv.).
Iconium (Acts xiii.–xiv.).
Lystra (Acts xiv.).
Derbe (Acts xiv.).
Unnamed localities in Galatia (Gal., 1 Pet. i. 1).
Unnamed localities in Cappadocia (1 Pet. i. 1).
Ephesus (Acts, Paul's epp.)
Colosse (Paul's ep.).
Laodicea (Paul's ep.).
Hierapolis in Phrygia (Paul's ep.).
Smyrna (Apoc. John).
Pergamum (Apoc. John).
Sardis (Apoc. John).
Philadelphia in Lydia (Apoc. John).
Thyatira in Lydia (Apoc. John).
Troas (Acts xvi., xx.; Paul's epp.).
Philippi in Macedonia (Acts xvi. ; Paul's epp.).
Thessalonica (Acts xvii. ; Paul's epp.).
Berea in Macedonia (Acts xvii. ; Paul's epp.).
Athens (Acts xvii. ; Paul's ep.).
Corinth (Acts xviii. ; Paul's epp.).
Cenchreæ, near Corinth (Paul's ep.).
Crete (ep. to Titus).
Rome (Acts xxvii. f. ; Paul's epp. ; Apoc. John.).[2]
Puteoli (Acts xxviii.).[3]

several churches must have already existed in each of the following provinces : Judea, Samaria, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia.

[1] Grand-nephews of Jesus (grandchildren of his brother Judas), whom Domitian wanted to call to book (according to the tale of Hegesippus), lived in Palestine as peasants.

[2] Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13) is probably Rome.

[3] The trace of Christianity said to have been found at Pompeii on a mutilated inscription (HRICTIAN ?) is uncertain.—It cannot be proved that Christians existed at this period in the towns mentioned by Acts but omitted from the above list (*e.g.*, Ashdod in Philistia, Seleucia, Attalia in Pamphylia, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Assus, Malta, Mitylene, Miletus, etc.). Nicopolis (in Epirus) is

Spain.[1]
Several churches in Bithynia and Pontus (1 Pet. i. 1; Pliny's ep. to Trajan).[2]
Alexandria (no direct evidence, but the fact is certainly to be inferred from later allusions).

During Trajan's reign, then, Christianity had diffused itself as far as the shores of the Tyrrhenian sea, perhaps even as far as Spain itself. Its headquarters lay in Antioch, on the western and northwestern shores of Asia Minor, and at Rome, where, as in Bithynia, it had already raised the attention of the authorities. "Cognitiones de Christianis," judicial proceedings against Christians, were afoot in the metropolis, and Nero, Domitian, and Trajan had taken action with reference to the new movement. *A propos* of Rome in Nero's reign, Tacitus speaks of a "multitudo ingens," while Pliny employs still stronger terms in reference to Bithynia, and Ignatius (*ad Ephes.* iii.) describes the Christian bishops as κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες, "settled in the outskirts of the earth." Decades ago the new religion had also penetrated the imperial court, and even the Flavian house itself.

II. Places where Christian communities can be

mentioned in Tit. iii. 12, Illyria in Rom. xv. 19, and Dalmatia in 2 Tim. iv. 10. Domitilla was banished to the island of Pontia or Pandataria.—I ignore, as uncertain, all the place-names which occur only in apocryphal Acts, together with all provinces and countries described there and nowhere else as districts in which missions are said to have existed as early as the apostolic age.

[1] It is a matter of controversy whether Paul carried out his design (Rom. xv. 24, 28) of doing missionary work in Spain. To judge from Clem. Rom. v. and the Muratorian fragment, I think it probable that he did. See also *Acta Petri* (Vercell.), vi.

[2] Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, pp. 211, 235) shows the likelihood of Amisus having contained Christians at this period.

traced before 180 A.D. (*i.e.* before the death of Marcus Aurelius).

To those noted under I., the following have to be added:

A number of churches in the environs of Syrian Antioch (Ignat., *ad Philad.*, 10), whose names are unknown, though one thinks of Seleucia in particular (cp. *Acta Pauli*): a number of churches in the environs of Smyrna (Irenæus, in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 20. 8), and many Asiatic churches (*ibid.*, v. 24).

Edessa (Julius Africanus, Bardesanes, etc.).

Churches in Mesopotamia or on the lower Tigris (see below, under III.).

Melitene (where the local legion, the "Thundering," contained a large number of Christians, as is proved by the miracle of the rain, narrated by Eus. v. 7, in the reign of M. Aurelius).

Magnesia, on the Meander (Ignatius).

Tralles in Caria (Ignatius).[1]

Philomelium in Pisidi (*Mart. Polyc.*).

Parium in Mysia (probably, acc. to the *Acta Oseniphori*).

Nicomedia (Dionys. Cor., in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23.).

Otrus in Phrygia (anti-Montanist, in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16).[2]

Hieropolis in Phrygia (probably, acc. to the inscription of Abercius).

Pepuza in Phrygia (Apollonius, in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 18).

Tymion (= Dumanli?) in Phrygia (*ibid.*).

[Ardaban = Κάρδαβα?] ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Φρυγίαν Μυσίᾳ (Anti-Montanist, in Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16; see Ramsay's *Phrygia*, p. 573. Only known to us as the birthplace of Montanus).

Apamea in Phrygia (Eus., v. 16).

Cumane in Phrygia (Eus., v. 16).

Eumenea in Phrygia (Eus., v. 16).

[1] Possibly we may venture, without undue temerity, to reckon Magnesia and Tralles among the churches which were founded previous to Trajan's reign.

[2] Ramsay (*St Paul the Traveller*, etc., third ed., 1897, pp. vii. f.): "Christianity spread with marvellous rapidity at the end of the first and in the second century in the parts of Phrygia that lay along the road from Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus, and in the neighbourhood of Iconium, whereas it did not become powerful in those parts of Phrygia that adjoined North Galatia till the fourth century."

Ancyra in Galatia[1] (Eus., v. 16).
Sinope (Hippol., in Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1).
Amastris in Pontus (Dionys. Cor., in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23).
Debeltum in Thracia (Serapion, in Eus., v. 19).
Anchialus in Thracia (*ibid.*).[2]
Larissa in Thessaly (Melito, in Eus., iv. 26).
Lacedæmon (Dionys. Cor., in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23).
Cnossus in Crete (*ibid.*).
Gorthyna in Crete (*ibid.*).[3]
Samê in Cephallene (Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, III. ii. 5).
A number of churches in Egypt (cp. Iren., i. 10, the activity of Basilides and Valentinus there, and retrospective inferences: details in III.).
Naples (catacombs).[4]
Syracuse (catacombs, but not absolutely certain).
Lyons (epistle of local church in Eus., v. 1 f.; Irenæus).
Vienna (Eus., v. 1 f.).
Carthage (certain inferences retrospectively from Tertullian).
Madaura in Numidia (martyrs).
Scilli in North Africa (martyrs).
Churches in Gaul (among the Celts; Iren.).
Churches in Germany (Iren.).[5]
Churches in Spain (Iren.).

Already there were Christians in all the Roman provinces, and in fact beyond the limits of the Roman empire. And already the majority of these Christians comprised a great union, which assumed a consolidated shape and polity about the year 180.

III. A list of places where Christian communities can be shown to have existed previous to 325 A.D. (the council of Nicæa); together with some brief account of the spread of Christianity throughout the various provinces.

[1] Myra in Lycia perhaps had a Christian community (cp. *Acta Pauli*).

[2] Byzantium, too, had probably a church of its own (cp. Hippol., *Philos.*, vii. 35; perhaps one should also refer to Tert., *ad Scap.*, iii.).

[3] See the following chapter for a discussion of the possibility of proving that Christians existed in Cyrene before 180 A.D.

[4] Clement (*Strom.*, I. i. 11) met with Christian teachers in Greater Greece.

[5] So that perhaps Cologne (possibly Mainz also?) had a church.

§ 1. Palestine.

The first steps in the diffusion of the gospel throughout Palestine (Syria-Palestina) are described, though merely in their characteristic traits, by the Acts of the Apostles, whose narrative I presuppose as quite familiar to my readers. From the outset it was Jerusalem and not the towns of Galilee, as one might imagine, that formed the centre of Christendom in Palestine. It was in Jerusalem that James, the Lord's brother,[1] took over the government of the church, after the twelve disciples had finally come to see that their vocation meant the mission-enterprise of Christianity (probably twelve years after the resurrection, as one early tradition has it, and not immediately after the resurrection).[2] He, in turn, was succeeded (60/61 or 61/62) by another relative of Jesus, namely, his cousin Simeon, the son of Cleopas, who was martyred under Trajan at the great age of 120. Thereafter, according to an early tradition, thirteen bishops of Jerusalem covered the period between (the tenth year of?) Trajan and the eighteenth year of Hadrian. This statement[3] cannot be correct, and the likelihood is that presbyters are included in the list. All these bishops were circumcised persons, which proves that the church was Jewish Christian — as indeed is attested directly for the apostolic age by Paul's epistles and the book of Acts (xxi. 20). It cannot, however, have adhered to

[1] His episcopal chair was still shown in the days of Eusebius (*H.E.*, viii. 19).

[2] Details in my *Chronologie,* i. pp. 129 f., 218 f.

[3] Zahn's (*Forschungen,* vi. 300) idea is that the number includes the names of contemporary bishops throughout Palestine.

the extreme claims of the Jewish Christians; that is, if any basis of fact, however late, underlies the decision of Acts xv. 28 f. At the first investment of Jerusalem the Christians forsook the city (Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 5, and Epiph., *Hær.*, xxix. 7, after Hegesippus or Julius Africanus), and emigrated to Pella; it was only a small number who eventually returned after the city had once more risen from its ruins.[1] In any case, the local church was small. We have no means of ascertaining its previous size, but the exodus of 68 A.D. precludes any large estimate.[2] All we know is that it comprised priests (Acts vi. 7), Pharisees (xv. 5), and Greek-speaking Jews from the Diaspora (vi. 5), and that it was not rich.[3] It disappeared completely, after Hadrian, on the conclusion of the war with Barcochba, had prohibited any circumcised person to so much as set foot within the city.

The new pagan city of Aelia Capitolina, founded on the site of Jerusalem, never attained any great importance.[4] Gentile Christians, however, at once

[1] This is clearly brought out by Epiph., *Hær.*, xxix. 7.

[2] Eusebius and Epiphanius (or their authorities) explicitly assert that all the Christians of Jerusalem withdrew to Pella. The statements of Acts (ii. 41, 47; iv. 4; vi. 7) upon the increase and size of the church at Jerusalem are dubious. The "myriads" of Christians mentioned in xxi. 20 are not simply Jerusalemites, but also foreigners who had arrived for the feast.

[3] Cp. the collection for Jerusalem, which Paul promoted so assiduously. Gal. ii. 10 is a passage which will always serve as a strong proof that the name "Ebionite" is not derived from a certain "Ebion," but was given to Jewish Christians on account of their poverty. (As against Hilgenfeld, and Dalman: *Werte Jesu*, 1898, p. 42; Eng. trans., pp. 52, 53).

[4] Cp. Mommsen's *Röm. Geschichte*, v. p. 546 [Eng. trans., ii. 225]: "The new city of Hadrian continued to exist, but it did not prosper."

settled there, and the date at which the first Gentile Christian bishop (Marcus) entered on his duties is fixed by Eusebius, on a reliable tradition, as the nineteenth year of Hadrian's reign, or one year after the war had ended. But before we put together the known facts regarding the church at Jerusalem, we must consider the spread of Jewish Christianity throughout Palestine.

"Churches in Judæa" are mentioned by Paul in Gal. i. 22 (cf. Acts xi. 29), and in 1 Thess. ii. 14 he writes: *ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.* In Acts we hear of churches on the seaboard, in Galilee and in Samaria. The larger part of these were Hellenized during the following century and passed over into the main body of Christendom.[1] When we ask what became of the

[1] Till then the brothers and relatives of Jesus (who took part in the Christian mission; cp. 1 Cor. ix. 5) played a leading rôle also in these Christian communities outside Jerusalem; as may be inferred even from the epistle of Africanus to Aristides (Eus., *H.E.*, i. 7), where we are told how the relatives of Jesus from Nazareth and Kochaba dispersed over the country (*τῇ λοιπῇ γῇ ἐπιφοιτήσαντες*), and how they bore the title of *δεσπόσυνοι* (§ 14). The tradition of Hegesippus is quite clear. He begins by recounting that *οἱ πρὸς γένους κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ κυρίου* (Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 11: "Those who were related to the Lord in the flesh") met after the death of James to elect his successor ("for the greater number of them were still alive," *πλείους γὰρ καὶ τούτων περιῆσαν εἰσέτι τότε τῷ βιῷ*). Then he tells of two grandsons of Jude, the brother of Jesus, who were brought before Domitian (iii. 19, 20). And finally he states that, after being released by Domitian, they "ruled over the churches, inasmuch as they were both witnesses and also relations of the Lord" (iii. 20. 8: *τοὺς ἀπολυθέντας ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὡσὰν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένους ὄντας τοῦ κυρίου*); cp. also iii. 32. 6:

Jewish Christians who could not agree to this transition,[1] we are obliged to cast back for a moment to the removal of the Christian community from Jerusalem. Eusebius writes as follows (*H.E.*, iii. 5): *τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας κατά τινα χρησμὸν τοῖς αὐτόθι δοκίμοις δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθέντα πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου μεταναστῆναι τῆς πόλεως καί τινα τῆς Περαίας πόλιν οἰκεῖν κεκελευσμένου, Πέλλαν αὐτὴν ὀνομάζουσιν, τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετῳκισμένων, κ.τ.λ.* ("The people belonging to the church at Jerusalem had been ordered by an oracle revealed to approved men on the spot before the war broke out, *to leave* the city and dwell in *a town of Peræa* called Pella. Then after *those who believed in Christ had withdrawn thither*," etc.). Epiphanius writes thus (*Hær.*, xxix. 7): *ἔστι δὲ αὕτη ἡ αἵρεσις ἡ Ναζωραίων ἐν τῇ Βεροιαίων περὶ τὴν Κοίλην Συρίαν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει περὶ τὰ τῆς Πέλλης μέρη, καὶ ἐν τῇ Βασανίτιδι τῇ λεγομένῃ Κωκάβῃ, Χωράβῃ δὲ Ἑβραιστὶ λεγομένῃ· ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ γέγονε μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλύμων μετάστασιν πάντων τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν Πέλλῃ ᾠκηκότων, Χριστοῦ φήσαντος καταλεῖψαι τὰ*

ἔρχονται οὖν καὶ προηγοῦνται πάσης ἐκκλησίας ὡς μάρτυρες καὶ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ κυρίου ("So they come and assume the leadership in every church as witnesses and relatives of the Lord"). This statement about ruling is vague, but it is hardly possible to take *προηγοῦνται* merely as denoting a general position of honour. Probably they too had the rank of "apostles" in the Christian churches; in 1 Cor. ix. 5, at any rate, Paul groups them with the latter as missionaries.

[1] *A priori* it is likely that there were also Jewish Christians who spoke Greek (and Greek alone). And this follows from the fact that a Greek version of the gospel according to the Hebrews existed during the second century. Outside Palestine and the neighbouring provinces (including Egypt), Jewish Christians who held aloof from the main body of the church were, in all likelihood,

Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἀναχωρῆσαι δι' ἣν ἤμελλε πάσχειν πολιορκίαν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑποθέσεως τὴν Περαίαν οἰκήσαντες ἐκεῖσε ὡς ἔφην διέτριβον ("Now this sect of the Nazarenes exists in Berœa in Coele-Syria, and in Decapolis in the district of Pella, and in Kochaba of Basanitis—called Khoraba in Hebrew. For thence it originated after *the migration* from Jerusalem *of all the disciples* who resided at Pella, Christ having instructed them to leave Jerusalem and retire from it on account of the impending siege. It was owing to this counsel that they went away, as I have said, to reside for a while at Pella"). Also *Hær.*, xxx. 2: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πάντες οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότες τὴν Περαίαν κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ κατῴκησαν, τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν Πέλλῃ τινὶ πόλει καλουμένῃ τῆς Δεκαπόλεως τῆς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραμμένης, πλησίον τῆς Βαταναίας καὶ Βασανίτιδος χώρας, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἐκεῖ μεταναστάντων καὶ ἐκεῖσε διατριβόντων αὐτῶν, γέγονεν ἐκ τούτου πρόφασις τῷ Ἐβίωνι. καὶ ἄρχεται μὲν τὴν κατοίκησιν ἔχειν ἐν Κωκάβῃ τινὶ κώμῃ ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Καρναίμ, Ἀρνὲμ καὶ Ἀσταρώθ, ἐν τῇ Βασανίτιδι χώρᾳ, ὡς ἡ ἐλθοῦσα εἰς ἡμᾶς

so few during the second century that we need take no account of them in this connection. Jerome (*ep. ad Aug.* 112, c. 13) does assert that Nazarenes were to be found in every Jewish synagogue throughout the East. "What am I to say about the Ebionites who allege themselves to be Christians? To this day the sect exists in all the synagogues of the Jews, under the title of 'the Minim'; while the Pharisees still curse it, and the people dub its adherents 'Nazarenes,'" etc. ("Quid dicam de Hebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? usque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judaeos heresis est, quae dicitur Minaeorum et a Pharisaeis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant"). But this statement is to be accepted with great caution. Jewish Christianity also got the length of India (= South Arabia or perhaps the Axumite kingdom, Eus., *H.E.*, x. 3; Socrat., i. 19; Philostorgius, ii. 6), as well as Rome. But its circles there were quite insignificant.

γνῶσις περιέχει [meaning that the Nazarenes also were to be looked for there]. ἤδη δέ μοι καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις . . . . περὶ τῆς τοποθεσίας Κωκάβων καὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας διὰ πλάτους εἴρηται ("For when *all who believed in Christ* had settled down about that time in Peræa, the majority of the *emigrants* taking up their abode at Pella, a town belonging to the Decapolis mentioned in the gospel, near Batanea and the district of Basanitis, Ebion got his excuse and opportunity. At first their abode was at Kochaba, a village in the district of Carnaim, Arnem, and Astaroth, in the reign of Basanitis, according to the information which we have received. But I am now told from other sources also, of his connection with the locality of Kochaba and Arabia far and wide"). Also Epiph., *de mens. et pond.* 15: ἡνίκα γὰρ ἔμελλεν ἡ πόλις ἁλίσκεθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐρημοῦσθαι προεχρηματίσθησαν ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ μεταστῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μελλούσης ἄρδην ἀπόλλυσθαι, οἵτινες μετανάσται γενόμενοι ᾤκησαν ἐν Πέλλῃ τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ πόλει πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· ἡ δὲ πόλις ἐκ Δεκαπόλεως λέγεται εἶναι ("For when the city was about to be captured and sacked by the Romans, *all the disciples* were warned beforehand by an angel to *remove* from the city, doomed as it was to utter destruction. On migrating from it they settled at Pella, the town already indicated, across the Jordan. It is said to belong to Decapolis"). Cp. lastly Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 18: [The Ebionites] "spring for the most part from Batanea [so apparently we must read, and not Ναβατέας] and Paneas, as well as from Moabitis and Kochaba in Basanitis on the other side of Adraa (τὰς ῥίζας ἔχουσιν ἀπό τε τῆς Βατανέας καὶ Πανεάδος τὸ

πλεῖστον, Μωαβίτιδός τε καὶ Κωχάβων τῆς ἐν τῇ Βασανίτιδι γῇ ἐπέκεινα Ἀδραῶν).

These passages and their sources (or source) afford a wide field for discussion and a still wider for conjecture,[1] particularly if we add that Julius Africanus also mentions Kochaba along with Nazareth[2] as the domicile of the relatives of Jesus. But their importance for our present purpose lies in the fact that they attest the scattering of most of the Jewish Christians resident in Palestine, west of the Jordan as well as at Jerusalem, in connection with and in consequence of the great war, and also their establishment, especially at Pella in Perea (or Decapolis), at Kochaba in Basanitis,[3] and in Berœa and its surround-

[1] For examples of these, see Zahn's *Forschungen*, vi. p. 270.

[2] But not Emmaus as well, for in my *Chronologie*, i. p. 220, I misunderstood the passage in Cod. Barocc. 142 (*Texte u. Unters.*, iv. 2, p. 169).—As there is a Kôkab el Hawâ south-east of Tabor, and therefore not too far from Nazareth (Baedeker's *Paläst. u. Syrien*, fifth ed., p. 252), it is natural to suppose that this is the village meant by Africanus. But as the Kochaba of Epiphanius certainly lies east of the Jordan, and as it would be extremely precarious to imagine that Africanus meant a different village from that of Epiphanius, Kôkab el Hawâ must be set aside. The epithet of "Jewish village," added by Africanus to both places, does not preclude us from looking for his Kochaba east of the Jordan, since even Nazareth, as situated in Galilee, is a Jewish village only in the broader sense of the term.—One notes, as a curious detail, that Conon, whose martyrdom is put by the legends under Decius, and who lived and died as a gardener at Magydus in Pamphilia, declares at his trial that he came from Nazareth and was a relative of Jesus (cp. von Gebhardt's *Acta Mart. Selecta*, p. 130).

[3] Kochaba is not the Kôkab situated about twenty kilometres [12½ miles] S.W. of Damascus (cp. Baedeker, pp. 295, 348, and the map), where Paul's conversion was located during the Middle Ages, for this spot disagrees with the detailed statements of Epiphanius, and, besides, Eusebius writes as follows in his Onomasticon: Χωβά, ἥ

ings (Coele-Syria).[1] Epiphanius, it is true, adds Batanea, Paneas, and Moabitis, but it cannot be affirmed that the dispersed Jewish Christians reached these districts at the same early period.[2] Flying from hatred and persecution at the hands of the Palestinian Jews, they rightly supposed that they would fare better in the Greek towns of the East and in the country. This proceeding, which had been carried

ἐστιν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ Δαμασκοῦ· ἔστι δὲ καὶ Χωβὰ κώμη ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μέρεσιν ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶν Ἑβραῖοι οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντες Ἐβιωναῖοι καλούμενοι ("Khoba, which is on the left of Damascus. There is also a village of Khoba in the same district where Hebrews are to be found, who believe in Christ; their name is Ebionites." So Jerome.) With this all the statements of Epiphanius agree (see further, *Hær.*, xl. 1: ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ ἐν Κωχάβῃ, ἔνθα αἱ τῶν Ἐβιωναίων τε καὶ Ναζωραίων ῥιζαι ἐνήρξαντο = In Arabia at Kochaba, where the origins of the Ebionites and Nazarenes lay). The locality, however, has not been re-discovered. Its site awaits future research, very possibly westward of Adraa (Der'at; cp. Baedeker, p. 186) and in the vicinity of Tell-el-Asch'ari, which lies not far from Der'at to the N.W., and may be identified with Karnaim-Ashtaroth (Baedeker, p. 183). Basanitis, or Batanæa, belonged to Arabia in the days of Epiphanius. Zahn (*Forsch.*, i. pp. 330 f.) is inclined to look for Kochaba much further south; but in order to make such a site probable, he has to cast doubts upon the precise language of Epiphanius. For this there is no obvious reason, especially as Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xxx. 2) observes that elsewhere he has given an explicit topographical account of Kochaba.

[1] It is doubtful if this migration took place at so early a period. It may have occurred later. Jerome found Jewish Christians in Berœa (*de vir. ill.* 3).

[2] Moabitis owes its mention perhaps to the impression produced by the fact that the Elkesaites (Sampsæans) were mainly to be found there; cp. *Hær.*, liii. 1: Σαμψαῖοί τινες ἐν τῇ Περαίᾳ . . . . πέραν τῆς Ἀλυκῆς ἤτοι Νεκρᾶς καλουμένης θαλάσσης, ἐν τῇ Μωαβίτιδι χώρᾳ, περὶ τὸν χειμάρρουν Ἀρνῶν καὶ ἐπέκεινα ἐν τῇ Ἰτουραίᾳ καὶ Ναβατίτιδι ("Certain Sampsæans in Peræa beyond the Dead Sea in Moabitis, in the vicinity of the Arnon torrent and across the borders in Ituræa and Nabatitis").

out at an earlier period in the dispersion of the Jerusalem-church after the outburst against Stephen, was repeated once more in a later age, when a number of Christian heretics during the fourth and fifth centuries fled from the State church into the eastern districts across the Jordan. All these movements of flight presuppose a group of people comparatively small in numbers, with little to lose in the shape of property. Hence we learn from them to form a moderate estimate of the numbers of these "Ebionites."[1] The latter, broken up more than once and subsequently liable in part to foreign influences, survived in these districts along the Jordan and the Dead Sea as late as the fourth century, and even later. Persecuted by the Jews, treated by the Gentile Christians as semi-Jews (and Jews indeed they were, by nationality and language [Aramaic]), they probably dragged out a wretched existence. The Gentile Christian bishops (even those of Palestine) and teachers rarely noticed them. It is remarkable how little Eusebius, for example, knows about them, while even Justin and Jerome after him evince but a moderate acquaintance with their ways of life. Origen and Epiphanius knew most about them. The former gives an account of their numbers, which is more important than the statement of Justin in his *Apology* (I. liii.: πλείονας τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρέων Χριστιανούς, see above, p. 151). He remarks (*Tom.* I. 1 *in Joh.*, ed. Brooke, i. pp. 2 f.), in connection with the 144,000 sealed saints of the Apocalypse, that this could not mean Jews by

[1] I may pass by here the vexed question as to the relationship between Nazarenes and Ebionites.

birth or Jewish Christians, *since one might quite well hazard the conjecture that there was not that number of Jewish Christians in existence.* Now this remark furnishes us with a rough idea of the number of Jewish Christians during the first half of the third century. Origen knew the districts where Jewish Christians chiefly resided, as is proved by his travels from Cæsarea to Bostra. He also knew the extent of the Jewish Christian synagogues in Alexandria and Lower Egypt, and these were their headquarters. Besides, we can appeal to yet another estimate of their numbers in this connection. Justin, himself a Samaritan by birth, observes in his *Apology* (I. xxvi.) that "almost all the Samaritans, with only a few foreigners, hail Simon Magus as their chief god." A hundred years later, Origen writes thus (*c. Cels.*, I. lvii.): "At present the number of Simon's disciples all over the world does not amount, in my opinion, to thirty. Perhaps that is even putting it too high. There are extremely few in Palestine, and in the other parts of the world, where he would fain have exalted his name, they are totally unknown."

Now let us come back to Aelia-Jerusalem and the Gentile Christian communities of Palestine which replaced the Jewish Christians. Marcus (135/136 A.D.) was the first Gentile Christian president in Aelia.[1] Like the town, the church of Aelia never

[1] The episcopal list (cp. my *Chronologie*, i. pp. 220 f.) up to 250 A.D. shows nothing but Greco-Roman names: Cassianus, Publius, Maximus, Julianus, Gaius, Symmachus, Gaius, Julianus, Capito, Maximus, Antoninus, Valens, Dolichianus, Narcissus, Dius, Germanion, Gordius, Alexander. Then come four names—Mazabanes, Hymenæus, Zabdas, and Hermon—two of which, of course, are Syrian.

attained any importance, as is abundantly plain from the negative evidence of Eusebius's Church-History, even when we take into account the fact that Eusebius was bishop of Cæsarea, the natural rival of Aelia. The latter was called "Aelia" even in ecclesiastical terminology (cp., *e.g.*, Eus., *H.E.*, ii. 12. 3; Dionys. Alex., *ibid.*, vii. 5; *Mart. Pal.* xi., though "Jerusalem" also occurs); which shows that even the church at first held that the old tradition had been broken.[1] Nevertheless, as is well known, the sacred Christian sites[2] were sought out during the second and third centuries; some of them were actually found and visited. A certain amount of theological activity is attested by the existence of a library established in Aelia by bishop Alexander at the opening of the third century (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 20).

Once the metropolitan episcopate came to be organized, the bishop of Cæsarea was metropolitan of Syria-Palestina; but it is quite clear, from the history of Eusebius, that the bishop of Aelia not

[1] By 300 A.D. the name "Jerusalem" had become wholly unfamiliar in wide circles. A good example of this is afforded by *Mart. Pal.*, xi. 10, which tells how a confessor described himself to the Roman governor as a citizen of Jerusalem (meaning the heavenly Jerusalem). "The magistrate, however, thought it was an earthly city, and sought carefully to discover what city it could be, and wherever it could be situated." Even were the anecdote proved to be fictitious, it is still highly convincing.

[2] Eusebius (*H.E.*, vi. 2, *à propos* of Alexander) gives an early instance of this, in the year 212/213. In consequence of all this, the repute of the Jerusalem church must have gradually revived or arisen during the course of the third century. The first serious evidence of it occurs in the case of Firmilian (Cyprian's *ep.* lxxv. 6), who upbraids the Roman church with failing to observe the exact methods followed by the church of Jerusalem.

merely was second to him, but shared with him the management of the synod. And as time went on, he gradually eclipsed his rival.[1] But under Origen Cæsarea became a second Alexandria, in point of theological learning and activity. Pamphilus, who founded the great library there, has the credit of having adhered firmly to the traditions of Origen and of having made the work of Eusebius possible.

We know nothing about the size of the Jerusalem-church or the percentage of Christians in the city. But until the intervention of Constantine they were unable to secure possession of the holy sepulchre (or what they both took to be its site; cp. Eus., *Vit. Const.*,

[1] The metropolitan nexus cannot be shown to have existed earlier than *c.* 190 A.D. (the Paschal controversy). Eusebius (v. 23) tells how Theophilus of Cæsarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem were then at the head of the Palestinian churches and synod. In noticing the synodal communication (v. 23), he puts Narcissus first, distinguishing also the bishops of Tyre and Ptolemais, who attended the synod, from the Palestinian bishops. The communication is interesting, as it incidentally mentions a constant official intercourse between the provincial churches of Palestine and the church of Alexandria. We have also to assume a Palestinian synod in the year 231/232, which determined not to recognize the condemnation of Origen by Demetrius (cp. Jerome's *epp.*, xxxiii. 4). In his epistle to Stephanus (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 51), Dionysius of Alexandria puts Theoktistus, bishop of Cæsarea, before Mazabanes, bishop of Aelia. But in the synodal document of the great Eastern synod of Antioch in 268 (Eus., vii. 30. 2), the bishop of Jerusalem precedes the bishop of Cæsarea, while at the synod of Nicæa Macarius of Jerusalem voted before Eusebius of Cæsarea. Eusebius only gives the episcopal list of Cæsarea as far back as 190 A.D., and that of Jerusalem as far back as James. But did Eusebius know of bishops at Cæsarea before 190? I pass over, as untrustworthy, the statement of Eutychius (cp. my *Chronol.*, i. p. 222) that Demetrius of Alexandria addressed a circular letter to Victor of Rome, Maxim(in)us of Antioch, and "Gąbius" (Gaius?) of Jerusalem.

iii. 26); which shows their lack of power within the city.[1]

In Acts we hear of Christians, outside Jerusalem, at Samaria (and in Samaritan villages; cp. viii. 25), Lydda (Diospolis), Saron,[2] Joppa, and Cæsarea. The presence of Christians (relatives of Jesus) at Nazareth is asserted by Africanus, while codex D of the New Testament locates Mnason, the old disciple, at an unnamed village between Cæsarea and Jerusalem.[3]

At Nicæa there were present the bishops of Jerusalem, Neapolis (Sichem), Sebaste (Samaria),[4] Cæsarea, Gadara, Ascalon, Nicopolis, Jamnia, Eleutheropolis (in the district of Beth-Gubrin; see Violet in *Texte u. Unters.*, xiv. 4, p. 73), Maximianopolis, Jericho, Sebulon, Lydda, Azotus, Scythopolis, Gaza, Aila, and Capitolias.[5] Elsewhere we have direct or inferential evidence[6] for the presence of Christians (though in very small numbers at particular spots) at Emmaus (Nicopolis) Sichar ('Asker), Bethlehem, Anea

[1] The Christian community in Cæsarea seems to have been more powerful. According to Socrates (iii. 23), who depends upon Eusebius, the later Neoplatonist Porphyry was beaten by Christians in Cæsarea.

[2] Acts ix. 33 seems to take Saron as a group of places.

[3] Whether the Peratæ, a gnostic sect, belonged to Peræa, may be questioned; see Hort and Mayor in their edition of Clement's *Strom.* vii. (1902) p. 354.

[4] The signatures to the Nicene council (Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, and Cunitz, 1898, p. lx.) give a double entry: Μαρῖνος Σεβαστηνός and Γαϊανὸς Σεβαστῆς, of whose meaning and origin alike we are entirely ignorant.

[5] The presence of bishops or Christians in several of these towns is attested also by Alexander of Alexandria (in Athanas., *de synod.* 17, and Epiph., *Hær.*, lxix. 4), and Eusebius (*Mart. Pal.*).

[6] I leave out the pseudo-Clementines.

by Eleutheropolis, Batanea by Cæsarea (Aulana), Anim, Jattir, Bethabara, and Phæno. Eusebius (*H.E.*, vi. 11. 3) mentions bishops of churches which were situated round (*πέριξ*) Jerusalem, even in the year 212/213; but we do not know who are meant. Similarly in *Mart. Pal.*, i. 3, he mentions *ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐκκλησιῶν*, "rulers of the country churches" (*i.e.* of churches in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea), who were martyred at Cæsarea under Diocletian. But unfortunately he does not specify the localities. Nor do we know anything about the church of Asclepius, the Marcionite bishop who was martyred in the persecution of Daza (Eus., *Mart. Pal.*, x. 1), or about the place to which the bishop mentioned by Epiphanius in *Hær.*, lxiii. 2 (*ἐν πόλει μικρᾷ τῆς Παλαιστίνης* = in a small town of Palestine) belonged. The latter outlived the era of the great persecution,[1] as he is expressly termed a confessor.

The large majority of the localities in Palestine where bishops or Christians can be traced, are Greek cities which lay scattered in large numbers up and down a land where Syriac was spoken, and where there was a large non-Hellenic population. It is among the Greeks of these cities that Christianity is first and foremost to be sought. If we further assume that in general, until Constantine mastered Palestine, there were no Christians[2] at all in Tiberias—

[1] This can hardly mean the persecution under Julian, as the bishop in question was dead by 370 A.D., after a long tenure of the episcopate.

[2] This does not follow from Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 4, for the permission granted by Constantine to Joseph to build churches there, might *per contra* suggest the presence of local Christians. But in xxx. 11 we read that Joseph merely secured one favour, viz.,

the headquarters of rabbinic learning—, in Diocæsarea (Sepphoris), in Nazareth, and in Capernaum (for the local Christians in primitive times had been driven out by the fanatical Jews); assuming also that they were extremely scanty in the territory stretching away to the south of Jerusalem,[1] then it is impossible to speak of Palestine being Christianized before the time of Constantine. Save for a few exceptions, the lowlands were Jewish, and in Jewish towns and localities Christians were only tolerated against the will of the inhabitants. In Diocæsarea, *e.g.*, even under Constantine, the Jews were still so numerous that they essayed a rising (Socrat., *H.E.*, ii. 33); and Theodoret (*H.E.*, iv. 19) narrates that in the reign of Valens the town was inhabited by Jews who murdered Christians. In the Hellenistic towns Christians were to be met with, but even there—with the exception of Cæsarea, of course—they were

permission to build churches in those Jewish towns and villages throughout Palestine "where no one had ever been able to erect churches, *owing to the absence of Greeks, Samaritans, or Christians.* Especially was this the case with Tiberias, Diocæsarea, Sepphoris, Nazareth, and Capernaum, where members of all other nations were carefully excluded" (ἔνθα τις οὐδέποτε ἴσχυσεν οἰκοδομῆσαι ἐκκλησίας, διὰ τὸ μήτε Ἕλληνα, μήτε Σαμαρείτην, μήτε Χριστιανὸν μέσον αὐτῶν εἶναι· τοῦτο δὲ μάλιστα ἐν Τιβεριάδι καὶ ἐν Διοκαισαρείᾳ, τῇ καὶ Σεπφουρίν, καὶ ἐν Καφερναοὺμ φυλάσσεται παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τινα ἄλλου ἔθνους). This is not contradicted by the statement of Epiphanius himself (xxx. 4) regarding a "bishop whose district adjoined that of Tiberias" (ἐπίσκοπος πλησιόχωρος τῆς Τιβερίων ὤν), in the pre-Constantine period; for this bishop was not exactly bishop of Tiberias.—There must have been numerous purely Jewish localities in Palestine; thus Origen (*in Matt.*, xvi. 17. 1) describes Bethphage as a village of Jewish priests.

[1] On some exceptions to this (Anim and Jattir) see below.—For idolatry in Mamre, see *Vit. Const.*, iii. 51–53.

not very numerous, while several important pagan towns with ancient shrines offered them a sharp resistance, and refused to harbour them at all. Thus in Gaza itself no Christian bishop was in residence, as may be certainly inferred from Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 13, where Silvanus is described as bishop of "the churches round Gaza" (cp. *Mart. Pal.*, xiii. 4: ἐκ τῆς Γαζαίων ἐπίσκοπος ὁρμώμενος Σιλβ., "Silvanus, a bishop from Gaza") at the time of the great persecution. Not until after 325 A.D. was the church organized strongly by Constantine amid the tough paganism of these towns (cp. *Vit. Const.*, iv. 38); thus even Asclepas, who was present at the council of Nicea (cp. Epiph., *Hær.*, lxix. 4), was no more than the bishop of the churches round Gaza,[1] although a rather small (and secret?) Christian conventicle is to be assumed as having existed in Gaza itself as early as the age of the persecution (see Eus., *Mart. Pal.*, viii. 4, iii. 1).[2] Palestinian Greek Christianity and its bishops gravitated southwards to Alexandria more readily than to Antioch and the north[3] (see above, on Eus., *H.E.*, v. 25); even

[1] The seaport of Gaza, Majuma, undoubtedly belonged to this group of churches.

[2] A Christian woman "from the country of Gaza" (τῆς Γαζαίων χώρας) is mentioned in Eus., *Mart. Pal.*, viii. 8.

[3] Eus., *Mart. Pal.*, iii. 3, supports the view that in the seacoast towns of Palestine Christianity was to be found among the floating population rather than among the old indigenous inhabitants. Six Christians voluntarily reported themselves to the governor for the fight with wild beasts. "One of them, born in Pontus, was called Timolaos; Dionysius, another, came from Tripolis in Phœnicia; the third was a subdeacon of the church in Diospolis, called Romulus: besides these there were two Egyptians, Paësis and Alexander, and another Alexander from Gaza." Hardly any of the martyrs at

in spiritual things it depended upon Alexandria throughout our period. One natural outcome of this relationship was the purely Greek, or almost purely Greek, character of Christianity in Palestine, which is brought out very forcibly by the names of the martyrs recounted by Eusebius (in his *Mart. Pal.*). In that catalogue Jewish or Syrian names are quite infrequent (yet cp. Zebinas of Eleutheropolis and Ennathas, a woman from Scythopolis, *Mart. Pal.*, ix. 5–6).[1]

Unfortunately the treatise of Eusebius to which reference has just been made furnishes far less instructive or statistical material for the church of Palestine than one would expect. We can only make out, from its contents, that it corroborates our conclusion that even in the Hellenistic towns of Palestine—which Eusebius has alone in view—during the great persecution there cannot have been very many Christians, Cæsarea being the town where they most abounded. This conclusion is ratified by all we can gather regarding the history of Christianity in Palestine during the fourth century, especially regarding the history of Christianity along the Philistine

Cæsarea were citizens of the town.—The relations between Palestine (Cæsarea) and Alexandria were drawn still closer by Origen and his learning. We also know that Africanus went from Emmaus to Alexandria in order to hear Heraclas, and so forth.

[1] Old Testament names—after the end of the third century, at least—do not prove the Jewish origin of their bearers; cp. *Mart. Pal.*, xi. 7 f.: "The governor got by way of answer the name of a prophet instead of the man's proper name. For instead of the names derived from idolatry, which had been given them by their parents, they had assumed names such as Elijah, or Jeremiah, or Isaiah, or Samuel, or Daniel."

seaboard.[1] The attempt made by Constantine and his successors to definitely acclimatize Christianity in Palestine did not succeed. Numberless churches, no doubt, were built on the holy sites of antiquity as well as at spots which were alleged to mark past deeds and events. Hordes of monks settled down there. Pilgrims came in their thousands. But there was no real Christianizing of the country as an outcome of all this, least of all in the haughty cities on the south-west coast. As late as 400 A.D. Gaza remained essentially a pagan city. Look at Sozom., vii. 15, and the *Vita Porphyrii* of Marcus (ed. Teubner, 1895). Here we are told that but a very few Christians—127 in all[2]—were to be found in Gaza, before Porphyry entered on his duties (394 A.D.), while the very villages near the city were still entirely pagan.[3] For our purpose that number 127 is highly valuable. It teaches us the necessity of confining within a very small compass any estimate we may choose to make of the Christianity which prevailed on

[1] See some data upon this in V. Schultze's *Gesch. des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (1892), ii. pp. 240 f., and especially the "Peregrinatio Silviae" (ed. Gamurini, 1887).

[2] *Vita Porphyr.*, p. 12. 1: οἱ τότε ὄντες Χριστιανοί, ὀλίγοι καὶ εὐαρίθμητοι τυγχάνοντες (cp. p. 74. 15), "The Christians of that day were few and easily counted." It is also noted (p. 20. 2) that Porphyry added 105 Christians in one year to the original nucleus of 127 Compare the following numbers: on p. 29. 10 there are sixty named, on p. 52. 1 thirty-nine, then on p. 61. 16 we have one year with three hundred converts, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος αὔξησιν ἐπέδεχετο τὰ Χριστιανῶν ("And thenceforward every year saw an increase to the strength of local Christianity").

[3] *Vit. Porphyr.*, p. 16. 7: πλησίον Γάζης κῶμαι τυγχάνουσι παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αἵτινες ὑπάρχουσιν τῆς εἰδωλομανίας ("Near Gaza there are wayside villages which are given over to idolatry").

the Philistine seaboard during the previous century. There is also significance in the fact that the name of "the old church" (p. 18. 6) was given to the church which Asclepas, who was bishop of Gaza during the great persecution and under Constantine, had erected subsequent to 325. This means that previous to 325 there were no Christian edifices in the place. Ascalon, too, had a strongly pagan population as late as the fourth century, just as Diocæsarea (see above) was inhabited by a preponderating number of Jews. The seaport of Anthedon remained entirely pagan as late as Julian's reign.

I now proceed to give a list of towns and localities in which Christians can be traced prior[1] to 325, adding very brief annotations.[2]

Jerusalem, represented at Nicæa; "churches round Jerusalem" in the year 212–213 are noted in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 11. 3.

Cæsarea on the coast (Acts x.). Bishops are to be traced from 190 A.D., viz., Theophilus (*circa* 190, Eus., *H.E.*, v. 22. 25); Theoktistus (at the crisis over Origen in Alexandria, also at the time of the Antioch-

[1] During the second century in particular, these churches were certainly to some extent infinitesimal. The following decision of the so-called Egyptian Church-Constitution is scarcely to be referred to Egypt. It rather applies to Palestine or Syria. Ἐὰν ὀλιγανδρία ὑπάρχῃ καὶ μήπου πλῆθος τυγχάνῃ τῶν δυναμένων ψηφίσασθαι περὶ ἐπισκόπου ἐντὸς ιβ′ ἀνδρῶν, εἰς τὰς πλησίον ἐκκλησίας, ὅπου τυγχάνει πεπηγυῖα, γραφέτωσαν, κ.τ.λ. ("Should there be a dearth of men, and should it be impossible to secure the requisite number of twelve capable of taking part in the election of a bishop, let a message be sent to churches in the neighbourhood").

[2] On the organization, size, and history of the Greek cities named in this list, see the careful collection of data in the third edition of Schürer's *History*.

ene synod regarding Novatian and bishop Stephanus of Rome, Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19. 17; vi. 46. 3 [where he is called "bishop in Palestine," as a metropolitan]; we do not know if he was the immediate successor of Theophilus); Domnus (who only ruled for a short period, according to Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 14; he succeeded Theoktistus in the reign of Gallienus); Theoteknus (who succeeded Domnus in the same reign, and took part in the synods against Paul of Antioch, Eus., vii. 14. 28, 30; vii. 32. 21, 24), and Agapius (Eus., vii. 32. 24). Counc. Nic. According to the legends the taxgatherer Zacchæus was the first bishop of Cæsarea. For "churches at Cæsarea," see *Mart. Pal.*, i. 3.

Samaria-Sebaste (Acts viii., Counc. Nic.; here John the Baptist was buried, acc. to Theod., *H.E.*, iii. 3).

Lydda Diospolis (Acts ix.; Theod., i. 4; Counc. Nic.).

Joppa (Acts ix.).

Saron (Acts ix.).

Emmaus - Nicopolis (Julius Africanus; Counc. Nic.).

Sichem-Neapolis (Counc. Nic.).

Scythopolis[1] (*Mart. Pal.*, ix. 6; p. 4. 7. 110, of longer form of *Mart. Pal.*, ed. Violet in *Texte u. Unters.*, xiv. 4; Alex. of Alex. in Athanas., *de synod.* 17; cp. Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 5; Counc. Nic.).

Eleutheropolis (*Mart. Pal.*, ix. 5; Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 3, lxvi. 1; Counc. Nic.).

Maximianopolis (Counc. Nic.).

Jericho [also a Greek city] (Counc. Nic.; cp. also Euseb., vi. 16).

[1] The biblical Beth-san (Baischan, Bêsân in Manasseh).

Sabulon (Counc. Nic.).

Jamnia (*Mart. Pal.*, xi. 5; Alex. of Alex. in Epiph., *Hær.*, lxix. 4; Counc. Nic.).

Azotus (Counc. Nic.).

Ascalon (*Mart. Pol.*, x. 1; Alex. of Alex. in Epiph., *Hær.* lxix. 4; Counc. Nic.).

Gaza (for a small local conventicle and the "churches round Gaza," see above; Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 3; Counc. Nic. Not merely at Gaza but also at the coast-town of Raphia, close to the border of Egypt, the pagans attempted to ward off Christianity by force as late as *c.* 400 A.D.; cp. Sozom., vii. 15).[1]

Aila (a seaport on the north-east corner of the Red Sea, included in Palestine at that period; Counc. Nic.).

Gadara (Counc. Nic.).

Capitolias (Counc. Nic.).

Bethlehem (the existence of a local Christianity follows from Orig.: *c. Cels.*, I. li.).

Anea, a village in the territory of Eleutheropolis (τῶν ὅρων Ἐλεοθεροπόλεως, *Mart. Pal.*, x. 2. Petrus Balsamus, the martyr, came from the district of Eleutheropolis; see Ruinart, p. 525).

Anim and Jattir, two villages south of Hebron (on Jattir, see Baedeker, p. 209; Anim = Ghuwîn = Ruwen; cp. Buhl's *Geogr. Pal.*, p. 164), which Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon*, declares to have been exclusively inhabited by Christians. This is a striking statement, as we are not prepared for Christians in these of all districts. We must not, however, measure the density of the Christian population on

[1] St Hilarion was born (about 250 A.D.) in Tabatha, "a village lying about 5000 paces from Gaza," but his parents were pagan.

the soil of Palestine by this standard. These two villages must have formed an exception to the general rule,[1] although it remains a notable fact that there were villages already which were completely Christian.

Bethabara (Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* describes it as a favourite spot for baptism, so that there must have been local Christians).

Sichar-'Asker (as Eusebius observes in his *Onomasticon* that a church was already built there, it follows that there must have been some local Christians at an earlier date).

Batanæa, a village beside Cæsarea (*Mart. Pal.*, xi. 29; where we are not to read Manganæa, Baganæa, Balanea, or Banea; see Mercati's "I Martiri di Palestina nel Codice Sinaitico," Estr. dai *Rendiconti* del R. Instit. Lombard. di sc. e lett., Serie II., vol. 30, 1897. To the best of my knowledge, however, the place has not been identified).

Phæno (according to *Mart. Pal.*, vii. 2, and Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 3, Christians laboured in the mines at Phæno in S. Palestine [cp. *Mart. Pal.*, viii. 1, and the *Onomasticon*]; according to *Mart.*, xiii. 1, they reconstructed houses into churches, and were consequently dispersed by force into settlements throughout the various districts of Palestine. The *Apology* of Pamphilus for Origen is directed "To the confessors

[1] Eusebius (vii. 12) tells of three Palestinian martyrs (Priscus, Malchus, and Alexander) in the reign of Valerian, stating explicitly that they lived on the land, and that they were reproached for thus enjoying an unmolested life whilst their brethren in the city were exposed to suffering. Hence they voluntarily betook themselves also to Cæsarea, etc. Unfortunately Eusebius has not specified their original home.

sentenced to the mines of Palestine" ["ad confessores ad metalla Palestiniae damnatos"]; cp. Routh's *Reliq. Sacrae*, IV.(2) p. 341).[1]

To sum up, we may say that, judged from a purely statistical standpoint, the policy of Maximinus Daza, which aimed at the utter eradication of Christianity, was by no means so insensate a venture in the case of Palestine as it was in that of Syria. Christianity won but a slender footing amid the Jewish population of the Holy Land; such Jewish Christians as there were, had for the most part withdrawn across the Jordan. Amid the Greek population, again, Christianity had not as yet any numerical preponderance;[2] evidently it drew its adherents

[1] In one town, Aulona, Petrus Balsamus is said to have been martyred. He came from the district of Eleutheropolis (according to the larger Syriac recension of the *Mart. Pal.*, he was born "in the district of Beth Gubrin"). The name of the place is variously written, and is to be identified with Anea (see above). Nor was he martyred there. It was, on the contrary, the place of his birth. No chor-episcopi from Palestine took part in the council of Nicæa. Was it because there were none at all? If so, it is a fresh corroboration of the fact that Christianity had penetrated but slightly into the (Jewish) population of the country. One can hardly appeal against this view, to the bishop "of the churches round Gaza" (see above), for in Gaza itself there could not be any bishop.

[2] One must not indeed under-estimate their numbers, for Eusebius would never have been able to say that "Christians are nowadays, of all nations, the richest in numbers" (*H.E.*, i. 4. 2), unless this element had been both noticeable and superior to the several religious associations of the country. The historian could not have passed such a verdict, if Christianity had been an insignificant factor in his own surroundings at Cæsarea. From Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 18 (μέγας τε καὶ μόνος ἀληθὴς ὁ Χριστιανῶν θεός, "The Christian's God is great, and the only true God") it follows also that public feeling, in Cæsarea at any rate, was not absolutely unfavourable to Christians;

from the fluctuating, poorer classes, rather than from the ranks of stable and propertied people. It is perfectly obvious, to judge from the treatise on the Palestinian martyrs (see above), that the latter section was hardly represented at all in local Christianity, and that so far as it did exist, it understood how to evade persecution. Thus it formed an unreliable asset for the church.

Christians in Palestine used Greek as the language of their worship; but, as we might *a priori* conjecture, several churches were bilingual (Greek and Aramaic). Direct proof of this is forthcoming in the case of Jerusalem and Scythopolis (*Mart. Pal.*, longer edition, pp. 4, 7, 110, ed. Violet in *Texte und Unters.*, xiv. 4). Procopius, we are told, himself a native of Aelia, did the church of Scythopolis the service of translating from Greek into Aramaic (Syriac), a statement which also proves that the service-books were still (*c.* 300 A.D.) untranslated into the vernacular. Translated they were, but orally.[2]

The notice further shows that the need of translation was not yet pressing. Translations of the scriptures

see also ix. 1. 11 (ὡς καὶ τοὺς πρότερον καθ' ἡμῶν φονῶντας, τὸ θαῦμα παρὰ πᾶσαν ὁρῶντες ἐλπίδα, συγχαίρειν τοῖς γεγενημένοις: "So that even those who formerly had raged against us, on seeing the utterly unexpected come to pass, congratulated us on what had occurred"), and especially ix. 8. 14 (θεόν τε τῶν Χριστιανῶν δοξάζειν, εὐσεβεῖς τε καὶ μόνους θεοσεβεῖς τούτους ἀληθῶς πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐλεγχθέντας τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖν: "Glorify the Christian's God, and acknowledge, under the demonstration of the facts themselves, that Christians were truly pious and the only reverent folk").

[1] Cp. here *Silviae Peregrinatio*, xlvii.: Et quoniam in ea provincia [Palestina] pars populi et graece et siriste novit, pars etiam alia per se graece, aliqua etiam pars tantum siriste, itaque, quoniam episcopus, licet siriste noverit, tamen semper graece loquitur et

into the Palestinian Aramaic dialect (I pass by what is recorded in Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 3. 12) were not made, so far as we have yet ascertained, until a later age. Fresh fragments of these versions have been recently made accessible, and we may expect still more of them. But it is unlikely that their originals will be pushed back into the third century.

§ 2. Phœnicia.[1]

As we learn from Acts, Christianity reached the cities of Phœnicia at a very early period. When Paul was converted, there were already Christians

numquam siriste, itaque ergo stat semper presbyter, qui, episcopo graece dicente, siriste interpretatur, et omnes audiant quae exponuntur. lectiones etiam, quaecumque in ecclesia leguntur, quia necesse est graece legi, semper stat, qui siriste interpretatur propter populum, ut semper discant. sane quicumque hic [sc. in Jerusalem] latini sunt, *i.e.* qui nec siriste nec graece noverunt, ne contristentur, et ipsis exponit episcopus, quia sunt alii fratres et sorores graeci-latini, qui latine exponunt eis ("And as in the province of Palestine one section of the population knows both Greek and Syriac, whilst another is purely Greek, and a third knows only Syriac, therefore, since the bishop, though he knows Syriac, *always speaks in Greek and never in Syriac*, a presbyter always stands beside him to interpret his Greek into Syriac, so that all the congregation may know what is being said. Also, as the readings from scripture in the church have to be in Greek, a Syriac interpreter is always present for the benefit of the people, that they may miss nothing of the lessons. Indeed, in case Latins here [in Jerusalem], *i.e.* people who know neither Greek nor Syriac, should be put out, the bishop expounds to them by themselves, since there are other brethren and sisters, Græco-latins, who expound to them in Latin").

[1] Phœnicia in the wider sense of the term (cp. subscript. Nicæa), but as distinguished from Syria. That an ecclesiastical province of this name existed in 231–232 A.D. is proved by Jerome, *ep.* xxx. 4: "Damnatur Origenes a Demetrio episcopo exceptis Palaestinae et Arabiae et Phoenicis atque Achaiae sacerdotibus."

at Damascus (Acts x. 2, 12 f., 19); for Christians in Tyre see xxi. 4, for Ptolemais see xxi. 7, for Sidon[1] xxvii. 2, and in general xi. 19.

The metropolitan position of Tyre, which was the leading city in the East for manufactures and trade, made it the ecclesiastical head of the province; but it is questionable if this pre-eminence obtained as early as the second century, for at the Palestinian synod on the Easter controversy Cassius, the bishop of Tyre, and Clarus, the bishop of Ptolemais, still took counsel with the bishops of Aelia and of Cæsarea (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 25), to whom they were accordingly, it may be, subordinate. On the other hand, Marinus of Tyre is mentioned in a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria (*ibid.*, vii. 5. 1) in such a way as to make his metropolitan dignity extremely probable. Martyrs in Tyre, during the great persecution, are noted by Eusebius, viii. 7. 1 (viii. 8), viii. 13. 3 (bishop Tyrannion), *Mart. Pal.*, v. 1 (vii. 1). Origen died at Tyre and was buried there. It is curious also to note that the learned Antiochene priest Dorotheus, the teacher of Eusebius, was appointed by the emperor (Diocletian, or one of his immediate predecessors) to be the director of the purple-dying trade in Tyre (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 32). A particularly libellous edict issued by the emperor Daza against the Christians, is preserved by Eusebius (ix. 7), who copied it from the pillar in Tyre on which it was cut, and the historian's work reaches

[1] In the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, the island of Aradus (xii. 12), Orthosia (xii. 1), and Paltus (xiii. 1), the frontier-town between Syria and Phœnicia, are all mentioned. Whether Christians existed there at that date is uncertain.

its climax in the great speech upon the reconstruction of the church at Tyre, "by far the most beautiful in all Phœnicia" (x. 4). The speech is dedicated to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, in whose honour indeed the whole of the tenth book of its history is written. Unfortunately we get no information whatever, from this long address, upon the Christian community at Tyre.

In Sidon the presbyter Zenobius (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 13. 3) died during the great persecution, as did some Christians at Damascus (ix. 5).

Eleven bishops, but no chor-episcopi, were present at the council of Nicæa from Phœnicia; namely, the bishops of Tyre, Ptolemais, Damascus, Sidon, Tripolis, Paneas, Berytus, Palmyra, Alasus,[1] Emesa, and Antaradus.[2]

Already (under Palestine) I have noted that Jewish Christians also resided in Paneas (on which town see, too, Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 17. 18).[3]

Tripolis is mentioned even before the council of Nicæa (in *Mart. Pal.*, iii., where a Christian named Dionysius comes from Tripolis); the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 46) affirm that Marthones was bishop of this town as early as the apostolic age; while, previous to the council of Nicæa, Hellanicus, the local bishop, opposed Arius (Theodoret, *H.E.*, i. 4),

[1] Where is this town to be sought for?

[2] The last-named is not quite certain (see Gelzer, *loc. cit.*, p. lxv. f.). Probably a twelfth still falls to be added, if the Θελέη of some MSS. is genuine, and if we may identify it with "Thelsea" near Damascus (*Itin. Ant.*, 196. 2).

[3] This passage at any rate leads us to infer that Christians existed there, whether the well-known statue (see above, vol. i. p. 145) really was a statue of Christ, or was merely taken to represent him.

though Gregory, bishop of Berytus, sided with him (*loc. cit.*; for Berytus see also *Mart. Pal.* iv.).

Eusebius (viii. 13) calls Silvanus, at the period of the great persecution, bishop, not of Emesa but of "the churches round Emesa" (τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Ἔμισαν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος).[1] Emesa then resembled Gaza; owing to the fanaticism of the inhabitants, Christians were unable to reside within the town itself, and had to quarter themselves in the adjoining villages. Anatolius, the successor of Silvanus, was the first to take up his abode within the town. With regard to Heliopolis we have this definite information, that the town acquired its first church and bishop, thanks to Constantine, after 325 A.D. (cp. *Vita Constant.*, iii. 58, and Socrat., i. 18).[2] The *Mart. Syriacum* mentions one martyr, Lucius, at Heliopolis. Christians also

[1] In ix. 6 he is simply called bishop, and he is said to have been martyred by Daza after an episcopate of forty years.

[2] Eusebius strongly emphasizes the unprecedented fact of a church being founded and a bishop being appointed at Heliopolis itself. Then he proceeds: "In his zealous care to have as many as possible won over to the doctrine of the gospel, the emperor gave generous donations for the support of the poor at this place also, so as even thus to stir them up to receive the truths of salvation. He, too, might almost have said with the apostle, 'Whether in pretence or in truth, let Christ anyhow be proclaimed.'" How tenaciously paganism maintained itself, however, in Heliopolis (which was still a predominantly pagan town in the sixth century) is shown by Schultze, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 250 f. On the local situation towards the close of the fourth century, see the notice of Peter of Alexandria (Theod., *H.E.*, iv. 19): "In Heliopolis no inhabitant will so much as listen to the name of Christ, for they are all idolaters. . . . The devil's ways of pleasure are in full vogue there. . . . The governor of the city himself is one of the leading idolaters" (cp. Sozom., vii. 15). As late as 57 the pagans were still in the majority at Heliopolis, but shortly before the irruption of Islam the local church had got the upper hand.

were deported (*Mart. Pal.*, xiii. 2) by Daza to Lebanon for penal servitude.

One martyrdom makes it plain that there were Christians at Byblus.—Further, and finally, we have to recall an interesting inscription, dated in the year 318–319 A.D. (630 of the Seleuc. era), which was discovered at Deir Ali (Lebaba), about three miles south of Damascus, by Le Blas and Waddington. It runs as follows:—

Συναγωγη Μαρκιωνιστων κωμ(ης)
Λεβαβων του κ(υριο)υ και σω(τη)ρ(ος) Ιη(σου) Χρηστου
προνοια(ι) Παυλου πρεσβ(υτερου)—του λχ′ ετους.[1]

["The meeting-house of the Marcionists, in the village of Lebaba, of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Erected by the forethought of Paul a presbyter—In the year 630."][2]

Thus there was a Marcionite community near Damascus in the year 318 (319) A.D. (Already, p. 260, we have found a Marcionite bishop in Palestine about the same period.)

We have no information in detail upon the diffusion and density of the Christian population throughout Phœnicia. More general and satisfactory notices are to hand with regard to Syria, a province with which Phœnicia was at that time very closely bound up, for the Phœnician tongue had long ago been dislodged by Syriac.[3] From the state of matters which still obtained in the second half of the sixth century,

[1] *Insc. Grec. et Latines*, iii. 1870, No. 2558, p. 582; cp. Harnack in *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* (1876), pp. 103 f.

[2] [*i.e.* of the Seleucid era.]

[3] On Constantine's destruction of the temple of Aphrodite in Aphaka, in the Lebanon, see *Vita Constant.*, iii. 55.

however, it is perfectly plain that Christianity got a firm footing only on the seaboard, while the inland district of Phœnicia remained entirely pagan in the main. Yet it was but recently, not earlier than the third century, that these Phœnician-Hellenic cults had undergone a powerful revival.

It is worthy of notice that the majority of the Phœnician towns where Christians or Christian bishops can be traced, lay on the coast; *i.e.* they were towns with a strong Greek population. In the large pagan cities of worship, Emesa and Heliopolis, on the other hand, Christians were not tolerated. Once we leave out inland localities where Marcionites and Jewish Christians resided, the only places in the interior where Christians can be traced are Damascus, Paneas, and Palmyra. Damascus, the great trading city, was Greek (cp. Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. p. 473; Eng. trans., ii. 146), as was Paneas, and in Palmyra, the headquarters of the desert-trade, a strong Greek element also existed (Mommsen, pp. 425 f.; Eng. trans., ii. 96 f.). The national royal house in Palmyra, with its Greek infusion, was well disposed towards the scanty indigenous Christians of Syria, as may be inferred from the relations subsisting between Paul of Samosata and Zenobia, no less than from the policy adopted by Rome against him.

§ 3. Coele-Syria.

In accordance with its tendency towards universal dominion, Christianity streamed from Jerusalem as far as Antioch (Acts xi.), the greatest city of the

East and the third city in the Roman empire, ere a few years had passed over its head. It was in Antioch that it got its name, which in all probability was originally a nickname;[1] for Antioch was a city of nicknames and of low-class literature. Here the first Gentile Christian community grew up; for it was adherents of Jesus drawn from *paganism* who were called "Christians" (cp. pp. 15 f.). Here Barnabas laboured. Here the great apostle Paul found his sphere of action, and ere long the Christian community became so important, possessed of such a vigorous self-consciousness and such independent activity, that its repute rivalled that of the Jerusalem-church itself.[2] Between the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch the cardinal question of the Gentile Christians was debated; it was the church of Antioch which took the most decided step forward in the history of the gospel; and as early as the second century it gave further expression[3] to its church-consciousness by designating the apostle Peter as its

[1] According to Theophilus, *ad Autol.*, i. 12, the pagans in Antioch even as late as 180 A.D. took the name "Christian" as a term of ridicule.

[2] In this connection special moment attaches to Acts xi. 27 f. (where the wealthier church of Antioch supports the brethren in Judæa), and further, to Acts xiii. 1 f.: Ἦσαν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι ὅ τε Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ, καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρῴδου τοῦ τετράχου σύντροφος καὶ Σαῦλος. λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον, κ.τ.λ. At the very outset a certain Nicolaus, προσήλυτος Ἀντιοχεύς (a proselyte from Antioch), appears as a guardian of the poor in Jerusalem.

[3] As also by the device of placing a great apostolic synod at Antioch (see the Excursus to Chap. V., Book I.).

first bishop—although, to judge from Gal. ii. 11 f., it was no glorious rôle that he had played in Antioch.

We know next to nothing of the history of Christianity in Coele-Syria during the first three centuries,[1] but a whole series of data is available for its history in Antioch itself. We possess, for example, the list of the Antiochene episcopate,[2] and the very names are instructive. Euodius, Ignatius, Heron, Cornelius, Eros, Theophilus, Maximinus, Serapion, Asclepiades, Philetus, Zebinus, Babylas, Fabius, Demetrianus, Paulus, Domnus, Timæus, Cyrillus, Tyrannus — the large majority of these names are Greek, and Greek was the language of the church. Its fame is established by Ignatius, after Paul. Several features (though they are not many) in the contemporary situation of the church at Antioch can be made out from the epistles of Ignatius, who proudly terms it "the church of Syria." He, too, had been preceded by other writers, so it was given out—quite erroneously, of course—in a later age. The bishops, Theophilus, Serapion, and Paulus,[3]

[1] We know that a seat, or the seat, of the sect of the Elkesaites was at Apamea, whence the Elkesaite Alcibiades travelled to Rome (Hipp., *Philos.*, ix. 13).

[2] Cp. my *Chronologie*, i. pp. 208 f. and elsewhere.

[3] The *Apology* of pseudo-Melito (Otto's *Corp. Apol.* ix.), composed about the beginning of the third century, was probably written in Syriac originally (and in Coele-Syria), but it is the one Syriac writing which can be named in this connection. Investigations into the Acts of Thomas have not yet advanced far enough to enable us to arrive at any certain decision upon the question whether they belong to the province of Edessa or to that of Western Syria. The overwhelming probability is, however, that they were composed in Syriac, and that they belong to Edessa—and in fact to the circle

however, were authors, as was the Antiochene presbyter Geminus (Jerome, *de vir. ill.*, lxiv.). Famous schools of learning were held by the presbyter Malchion (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 29), the presbyter Dorotheus (vii. 23), and above all by Lucian. The church of Antioch also took its share in the great general controversies, the Montanist, the Novatian, the baptismal, and the Christological, and it maintained a lively intercourse with other churches. It mediated between the church at large, which was substantially Greek, and the Syriac East, just as the Roman church did between the former and the Latin-speaking West.[1] Further, unless the evidence is totally misleading, it was the church of Antioch which introduced into the cultus of Greek Christendom its strongly rhetorical element —an element of display and fantasy. Once more, it was in this church that the dynamic Christology received its most powerful statement, that Arianism arose, and that the ablest school of exegesis flourished.

The central position of the church is depicted in the great synods held at Antioch in the middle of the third century. Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 46) wrote to Cornelius of Rome that he had been invited to a synod at Antioch (251 A.D.) by Helenus

of that great Eastern missionary and teacher, Bardesanes; cp. Nöldeke in Lipsius: *Apokr. Apostelgeschichten*, ii. 2, pp. 423 f., and Burkitt in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. pp. 280 f. The gnostic Saturninus (Satornil) also belonged to Antioch (cp. Iren., I. xxiv. 1), and other gnostic sects and schools originated in Syria.

[1] It is instructive to observe how Cornelius of Rome plumes himself upon the greatness of Rome, in writing to Fabius of Antioch (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 43). He had good occasion to do so, in view of Antioch itself.

of Tyre and the other bishops of the country, as well as by Firmilian of Cappadocia and Theoktistus, a Palestinian bishop (of Cæsarea). The outcome of the synod is described by him in a letter to Stephen of Rome (*ibid.*, vii. 5): "Know that all the churches of the East, and even beyond it, which previously were divided, have once more become united. All over, the bishops are harmonious and unanimous, greatly delighted at the unexpected restoration of peace among the churches." He then proceeds to enumerate the bishops of Antioch, Cæsarea, Aelia, Tyre, Laodicea, Tarsus, "and all the churches of Cilicia, besides Firmilian and all Cappadocia—for, to avoid making my letter too long, I have merely named the most prominent among them. Add all Syria and Arabia, with Mesopotamia, Pontus, and Bithynia." Setting aside the two last-named provinces, we may say that this forms a list of the provinces over which the influence of Antioch normally extended.[1] To the last great synod at Antioch against Paulus, the Antiochene bishop, no fewer than seventy or eighty bishops gathered from all the provinces, from Pontus to Egypt;[2] for it must be remembered, the Christological crisis, in which their metropolitan was the "heretic" of the hour, was of supreme moment to

[1] This also serves to explain the well-known passage in the sixth canon of Nicæa: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ("Likewise with regard to Antioch and throughout the other provinces, the churches are to have their due prerogatives secured to them").

[2] Eusebius (*H.E.*, vii. 28) speaks of μύριοι ("thousands"), Athanasius gives seventy (*de synod.* 43), and Hilarius (*de synod.* 86), eighty bishops. Basilius Diaconus (fifth century) gives a hundred and eighty.

the church. Unfortunately we know nothing of the seats of these bishops.[1]

Although the information which we possess upon the appearance of Paul at Antioch in the rôle of bishop comes from a hostile pen, it throws light on the size and secular conformation of the local Christian community in the second half of the third century (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 30).[2] "At an earlier period he was poor and a beggar. He neither inherited any means from his parents, nor did he make any money by any craft or trade whatever; yet he is now in possession of extravagant wealth, thanks to his iniquitous transactions, his acts of sacrilege, and his extortionate demands upon the brethren. For he officiously recommends himself to people who are wronged, promising to help them for a consideration. Yet all he does is to cheat them, making a profit for himself, without any service in return, out of litigants

[1] The paper of the Antiochene synod to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria as well as to the whole church (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 30) mentions, in its address, the names of Helenus (Tarsus), Hymenæus (Jerusalem), Theophilus (?), Theoteknus (Cæsarea), Maximus (Bostra), Proclus (?), Nicomas (?), Aelianus (?), Paulus (?), Bolanus (?), Protogenes (?), Hierax (?), Eutychius (?), Theodorus (?), Malchion (presbyter of Antioch), and Lucius (probably also a presbyter of Antioch). Unfortunately, the bishoprics of the majority are unknown.

[2] According to Oriental sources of information (cp. Westphal, *Unters. über die Quellen und die Glaubwürdigkeit der Patriarchalchroniken des Marī ibn Sulaimān*, etc., 1901, pp. 62 f.), Demetrianus, Paul's predecessor in the see of Antioch, was exiled to Persia. This tradition, which answers to the general situation and has nothing against it (it was unknown to me when I wrote my *Chronology of Early Christian Literature*), proves that about 200 A.D. both the church of Antioch and its bishop possessed some political weight.

who are quite ready to pay money in order to get quit of a troublesome business. Thus he treats piety as a means of making some profit. He is haughty and puffed up; he is invested with secular dignities; he would rather be called 'ducenarius' [an imperial procurator of the second rank] than 'bishop'; he strides ostentatiously up and down the public squares, reading or dictating letters publicly in the middle of his walk, and having a numerous retinue who escort him in front and behind. Thus by his arrogance and insolence our faith wins ill-will and hatred from the public. In the assemblies of the church his inordinate ambition and vainglorious pride make him behave in an inexplicable fashion, and thus he captivates the minds of simple folks till they actually admire him. He has a platform and a high throne erected for himself, unlike a disciple of Christ. Also, like secular officials, he has his private cabinet (*secretum*). He strikes his hand upon his thigh, stamps with his feet upon the platform, and inveighs with insolent insults against those who, instead of breaking out in applause of himself, or waving their handkerchiefs like the audience in a theatre, or shouting aloud and jumping like the men and women of his own company who behave in this indecent fashion, prefer to listen to him reverently and quietly as befits the house of God. Dead expositors of the word of God are assailed in public with coarse and vulgar taunts, while the speaker exalts himself in swelling terms as if he were a sophist or juggler and not a bishop. Hymns in praise of our Lord Jesus Christ he puts a stop to, as too recently composed by modern men; whereas he has songs sung to his own praise and glory by women

in the public congregation on the opening day of the paschal feast, songs which might well make any audience shudder. Similar notions are advocated, at his instigation, by the bishops of neighbouring localities and towns who fawn upon him, as well as by the priests in their addresses to the people. Thus he will not acknowledge, with us, that the Son of God has come down from heaven. . . . Jesus, he says, is from below. Whereas those who sing hymns in his own honour and publicly praise him, assert that he himself has come down as an angel from heaven; and instead of checking such outbursts, he is even present in all his arrogance when they are uttered. Furthermore, he has 'virgines subintroductae' of his own, 'lady companions,' as the people of Antioch call them. So have the priests and deacons of his company, of which, as of all the rest of their pernicious errors, he is perfectly cognisant. But he connives at them, in order to attach the men to himself, and prevent them, through fear of personal consequences, from daring to challenge his own unrighteous words and deeds. . . . Even if he should have committed no act of immorality [with regard to the 'virgines'], still he ought to have eschewed the suspicion of it. . . . He has indeed dismissed one such woman, but he still retains two in the bloom and beauty of their sex, takes them with him on his travels, and lives meanwhile in sumptuous and luxurious fashion. Such practices make everyone groan and lament in private. But no one dares to bring him to task, such is their dread of his authority and tyranny. Yet for such practices one would call him to account [*i.e.* not condemning him outright, nor conniving at his

actions], if he still held the catholic position and belonged to our own number."

I have quoted this passage *in extenso*, as I think it is extremely important for the spread and the position of the church in Antioch at that period. The best established feature in the whole description (for the malicious charges, which are a proof of Antiochene journalism, may be largely relegated to the background) is that the bishop had by this time assumed, or been forced to assume, the customs and forms of a high state-official, a feature which brings out very clearly the development and importance of the local Christian community. Besides, the relations between Paul and the royal house of Palmyra (Syrian by race), so far as these are known or may be conjectured,[1] show that Christianity already played a political rôle in Antioch. Furthermore, the authentic document given by Eusebius tells us that Paul refused to admit his condemnation, nor did he evacuate his episcopal residence. Whereupon—Zenobia meanwhile having been conquered by Rome, and the collateral rule of the house of Palmyra having been overthrown in Egypt and throughout the East—the matter was laid before the emperor Aurelian, who ordered (A.D. 272) the residence to be handed over to the bishop with whom the Christian bishops of Italy and Rome were

[1] Paul's entrance on his episcopate at Antioch fell at the very period, and probably in the very year, when the Persians captured Antioch. As soon as the Persians retreated, Gallienus appointed Odænathus to what was really an independent authority over Palmyra and the East. Paul must have understood admirably how to curry favour with this ruler and his queen Zenobia, for, in spite of his episcopal position, he was imperial procurator of the second rank in Antioch.

in epistolary communion. This forms a conspicuous example of the political significance attaching to the church of Antioch.

It is impossible to make any statistical calculations as to the dimensions of the church about 320 A.D., but at any rate there were several churches in the city (Theod., *H.E.*, i. 2), and if the local Christians were in the majority in Julian's reign, their number must have been very large as early as the year 320. Diodorus and Chrysostom preached in what was substantially a Christian city, as the latter explicitly attests in several passages. He gives the number of the inhabitants (excluding slaves and children) at 200,000 (*Hom. in Ignat.* 4), the total of members belonging to the chief church being 100,000 (*Hom.* 85 [86] c. 4.)[1] Antioch in early days was always the stronghold of Eastern Christianity, and the local church was perfectly conscious of its vocation as the church of the metropolis. The horizon of the Antiochene bishop extended as far as Mesopotamia and Persia, Armenia and Georgia, and he felt himself in duty bound to superintend the mission and consolidation of the church throughout these countries. Similarly, he recognized his duties with regard to the defence of the church against heretics. It was from Antioch that the missionary impulse of Chrysostom proceeded, as well as the vigorous campaign against the heretics waged by the great exegetes, Diodorus and Theodoret, Chrysostom and Nestorius.

Outside the gates of Antioch, that "fair city of the

[1] Cp. Schultze (*op. cit.*, ii. p. 263); Gibbon (*The Decline and Fall*, Germ. trans. by Sporschil, ii. p. 219) takes the 100,000 to represent the total of the Christians in Antioch itself.

Greeks" (see Isaac of Antioch's *Carmen* 15, ed. Bickell, i. 294), Syriac was the language of the people, and only in the Greek towns of the country was it displaced by Greek. The Syriac spirit was wedded to it, however, and remained the predominant factor in religious and in social life. Yet in the distinctively Syrian world, Christianity operated from Edessa (see below) rather than from Antioch, unless we are wholly mistaken. The wide districts lying between both cities were consequently evangelized from two centres during the third century; from Antioch in the West by means of a Greek Christian propaganda, and from Edessa in the East by means of one which was Syriac Christian. Hence we must infer that the larger towns practically adopted the former, while the country towns and villages went over to the latter. The work of conversion, so it would appear, made greater headway in Coele-Syria, however, than in Phœnicia. By about 325 the districts round Antioch seem to have contained a very large number of Christians, and one dated (331) Christian inscription from a suburban village runs as follows: "Christ, have mercy; there is but one God." In Chrysostom's day these Syrian villages appear to have been practically Christian. Lucian, the priest of Antioch, avows in his speech before the magistrate in Nicomedia (311 A.D.) that "almost the greater part of the world now adheres to this Truth, yea *whole cities*; even if any seems suspect, there is no doubt regarding multitudes of country-folk, who are innocent of guile" ("pars paene mundi iam maior huic veritati adstipulatur, urbes integrae, aut si in his aliquid suspectum videtur,

contestatur de his etiam agrestis manus, ignara figmenti"); and although this may embody impressions which he had just received in Bithynia, there was substantially a basis for the statement to be found in the local circumstances of Syria. The numbers of the clergy in 303 throughout Syria are evident from Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 6: "An enormous number were put in prison *at every place*. The prisons, hitherto reserved for murderers and riflers of graves, were now packed everywhere with bishops, priests, deacons, lectors, and exorcists." The data at our command are as follows:—

(1) Acts (xv.) already tells of churches in Syria besides Antioch.

(2) Ignatius, *à propos* of Antioch (*ad Philad.* 10), mentions "churches in the neighbourhood" (ἔγγιστα ἐκκλησίαι) which had already bishops of their own. These certainly included Seleucia, the seaport of Antioch mentioned in Acts xiii. 4.

(3) Apamea was a centre of the Elkesaites (cp. above, vol. i. pp. 71, 465).

(4) Dionys. Alex. (in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 5) observes that the Roman church frequently sent contributions to the Syrian churches.

(5) The communication of the Antiochene synod of 268 (Eus., vii. 30), mentions, in connection with Antioch, "bishops of the neighbouring country and cities" (ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων). From Eus., vi. 12, we know that by about 200 A.D. there was a Christian community (and a bishop?) at Rhossus which was gravitating towards Antioch.

(6) Two chor-episcopi from Coele-Syria attended the council of Nicæa. In *Martyrol. Hieron.* (Achelis,

Mart. Hieron., p. 168), a martyrdom is noted as having occurred "in Syria vico Margaritato," as well as another (p. 177 f.) "in Syria provincia regione Apameae vico Aprocavictu," but both these places are unknown.

(7) The number of town-bishops from Coele-Syria who were present at Nicæa was, relatively, very considerable; representatives were there from Antioch, Seleucia, Laodicea, Apamea, Raphanea, Hierapolis, Germanicia (= Marasch), Samosata, Doliche, Balaneæ (cp. *Hom. Clem.*, xiii. 1), Gabula, Zeugma, Larisa, Epiphania, Arethusa, Neocæsarea, Cyrrus, Gindarus, Arbokadama, and Gabbala (= Gaba?). These towns lay in the most diverse districts of this wide country, on the seaboard, in the valley of the Orontes, in the Euphrates valley, between the Orontes and the Euphrates, and in the north. Their distribution shows that Christianity was fairly uniform and fairly strong in Syria about 325,[1] as is strikingly proved by the rescript of Daza to Sabinus (Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 9) —for we are to think of the experiences undergone by the churches of Syrian Antioch and Asia Minor, when we read the emperor's words about σχεδὸν ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους καταλειφθείσης τῆς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας τῷ

[1] The opposition offered to Christianity varied considerably in the various towns. In Apamea it would seem to have been particularly keen. Even as regards *c.* 400 A.D., Sozomen (vii. 15) observes: Σύρων δὲ μάλιστα οἱ τοῦ ναοῦ Ἀπαμείας· οὓς ἐπυθόμην ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ναῶν συμμαχίαις χρήσασθαι πολλάκις Γαλιλαίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Λίβανον κωμῶν, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον προελθεῖν τόλμης ὡς Μάρκελλον τὸν τῇδε ἐπίσκοπον ἀνελεῖν ("I have been told that the Syrian inhabitants of Apamea often employed the men of Galilee and the Lebanon villages to aid them in a military defence of their temple, and that at last they actually went so far as to slay the local bishop") [who had had the temple demolished].

ἔθνει τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἑαυτούς συμμεμιχότας ("*almost all men* abandoning the worship of the gods and attaching themselves to the Christian people"). This remark is not to be taken simply as a rhetorical flourish. For after speaking in one place about the first edict of Diocletian, Eusebius proceeds as follows: οὐκ εἰς μακρὸν δὲ ἑτέρων κατὰ τὴν Μελιτηνὴν οὕτω καλουμένην χώραν καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἄλλων ἀμφὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἐπιφυῆναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ πεπειραμένων, τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας εἱρκταῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς ἐνεῖραι πρόσταγμα ἐφοίτα βασιλικόν ("Not long afterwards, as some people in the district called Melitene and in other districts throughout Syria, attempted to usurp the kingdom, a royal decree went forth to the effect that the head officials of the churches everywhere should be put in prison and chains," viii. 6. 8). Eusebius does not say it in so many words, but the context makes it quite clear that the emperor held the Christians responsible for both of these outbreaks (that in Melitene being unknown to history); which shows that the Christians in Melitene and Syria must have been extremely numerous, otherwise the emperor would never have met revolutionary outbursts (which in Syria and, one may conjecture, in Melitene also, originated with the army) with edicts against the Christian clergy.

All that we know about the earlier history of Christianity in the towns is confined to some facts about Laodicea (where bishop Thelymidres was prominent about 250 A.D.; cp. Eus., vi. 46; he was followed by Heliodorus, vii. 5, and subsequently by Eusebius of Alexandria, and the famous Anatolius, vii. 32), Arethusa (cp. *Vit. Constant.*, iii. 62), and

Samosata (the birthplace of Paul of Antioch, though we do not know if he was of Christian birth). The bishop of Rhossus was not at Nicæa (though Rhossus may also be assigned to Cilicia). But, as we have seen above, Rhossus did possess a Christian church about 200 A.D., which came under the supervision of the church at Antioch. There was a Jewish Christian church at Beroea (Aleppo) in the fourth century (cp. p. 251).[1]

Finally, we have to take account of the pseudo-Clementine epistle *de virginitate*, which probably belongs to the beginning of the third century, and either to Palestine or to Southern Syria.[2] It contains directions for itinerant ascetics, and five classes are given of places where such people stayed and passed the night. (1) Places with a number of married brethren and ascetics; (2) places with married brethren but without ascetics; (3) places where there were only Christian wives and girls; (4) places where there was only one Christian woman; and (5) places where there were no Christians at all. The third and fourth classes are of special interest. They testify

[1] Of one bishop in Syria (προεστώς τις τῆς ἐκκλησίας), Hippolytus relates (*in Daniel*, p. 230, ed. Bonwetsch; see above, p. 233) that his enthusiastic fanaticism seduced his fellow-members into the wilderness with their wives and children in order to meet Christ. The local governor had them arrested, and they were almost condemned as robbers, had not the governor's wife, who was a believer (οὖσα πιστή), interceded on their behalf. Unfortunately Hippolytus does not name the locality.—There were Novatian churches also in Syria (cp. the polemical lecture of Eusebius of Emesa, in the fourth century; Fabius of Antioch had sided with the Novatians). But we do not know where to look for them.

[2] Cp. my study of it in the *Sitzungsberichte d. k. Pr. Akad. Wiss.*, 1891, pp. 361 f.

to what is otherwise well known, viz., that women formed the majority within the Christian communities. We also get an instructive picture of the state of morals and manners, in the directions given for the behaviour of an ascetic in places where no Christians were to be found at all. This account [for which see vol. i. pp. 254–255, note] has small country churches in view. And their number must have been considerable. Theodoret observes that his diocese of Cyrrus contained 800 parishes. By that time, of course, over a century had passed since the days of Constantine, but nevertheless a number of these parishes were earlier than that emperor's reign.

§ 4. Cyprus.

At Salamis and Paphos Barnabas the Cypriote and Paul had already done mission-work (Acts xiii.), while Barnabas and Mark once more returned to the island later on as missionaries (Acts xv.). Jews abounded in Cyprus, so that the way lay open for the Christian propaganda. It was Cypriote Jewish Christians who brought the gospel to Antioch (Acts xi.). The heretic Valentinus is said ultimately to have laboured in Cyprus, and during the great persecution Christians from the mainland were banished to the mines of Cyprus (*Mart. Pal.*, xiii. 2). Three Cypriote bishops, from Salamis, Paphos, and Trimithus, were present at the council of Nicæa, and three bishoprics for an island of no great size indicate a strong church. Nor were these all; for in the history of Spyridon, bishop of Trimithus, we hear of "bishops of Cyprus," amongst whom was Triphyllius,

bishop of Ledrae (Sozom., i. 11). Rufinus, Socrates (i. 12), and Sozomen, all tell us about Spyridon. He was a yeoman and herdsman, and remained so even after he was elected a bishop—which throws light upon the classes of the population to which Christianity had penetrated. Triphyllius, his colleague, again, was a man of high culture who had studied jurisprudence at Berytus. Sozomen tells a good story about the relations between the two men. At a provincial synod in Cyprus, Triphyllius was preaching, and in describing the story of the paralytic man he used the word *σκίμπους* ("bed") instead of the popular term *κράβαττον* ("pallet"). *Καὶ ὁ Σπυρίδων ἀγανακτήσας, οὐ σύ γε, ἔφη, ἀμείνων τοῦ κράββατον εἰρηκότος, ὅτι ταῖς αὐτοῦ λέξεσιν ἐπαισχύνῃ κεχρῆσθαι* ("Whereupon Spyridon wrathfully exclaimed, 'Art thou greater than he who spake the word "bed," that thou art ashamed to use the very words which he used?'"). The story illustrates one phase of the history of local culture.

§ 5. Edessa and the East (Mesopotamia, Persia, Parthia, and India).

Perhaps the most remarkable fact in the history of the spread of Christianity is the rapid and firm footing which it secured in Edessa. The tradition about the correspondence between Jesus and king Abgar, and about the local labours of Thomas or Thaddæus (Eus., *H.E.*, i. 13), is of course entirely legendary, while Eusebius is wrong in asserting (ii. 1. 7) that *the entire city* had been Christian *from the apostolic age* to his own time. But the statement must hold true of the age at which he wrote. In

part, also, it applies still further. For there is no doubt that even before 190 A.D. Christianity had spread vigorously within Edessa and its surroundings, and that (shortly after 201 or even earlier?) the royal house joined the church,[1] while even during the Easter controversy (*c.* 190 A.D.) "the churches in Osroene and the local towns" (implying that there were several bishoprics) addressed a communication to Rome.[2] Christianity in Edessa starts with two persons, Tatian "the Assyrian" and Bardesanes (born 154 A.D.). The former compiled his volume of the gospels (or "Diatessaron") for the Syrian church, while the latter established and acclimatized Christianity by dint of his keen doctrinal activity, his fanciful theology, and his sacred songs. Neither was a "Catholic" Christian. Measured by the doctrinal standards of the Catholic confederation, both were heretics. But they were "mild" heretics.[3] And

[1] On the "Acta Edessena" see Tixeront's *Les origines de l'église d'Édesse* (1888), Carrière's *La légende d'Abgar* (1895), von Dobschütz's "Christusbilder" in the *Texte u. Unters.*, N.F. iii., and my *Litt.-Geschichte*, i. pp. 533 f. The great church-buildings were not erected till 313 (cp. the chronicle of Edessa in *Texte u. Unters.*, ix. 1, p. 93), but there was a Christian church as early as 201 (cp. *ibid.*, p. 86).

[2] In the *Doctrina Addaei* (p. 50; Phillips) Serapion of Antioch (192–209) is said to have consecrated Palut as bishop of Edessa. This may be, but Palut can hardly have been the first bishop of the see; he was the first Catholic bishop.

[3] "As heresies were increasing in Mesopotamia, Bardesanes wrote against the Marcionites and other heretics." This remark of Eusebius (iv. 30) displays astonishing ignorance. In the *Philosoph.* (vii. 31) of Hippolytus, Bardesanes is called "The Armenian"; a distinguished pupil of Marcion, Prepon, is also mentioned and described as an "Assyrian."—See above, p. 278, for the probable connection of the *Acta Thomæ* with the circle of Bardesanes.

from the beginning of the third century onwards Catholics (Palutians) and Bardesanists opposed each other in Edessa.

Tatian's Diatessaron was retained even by the Catholic party in Edessa, although it was not entirely orthodox. The version of the gospels by themselves, which lies before us in the Syrus Sinaiticus and the Syrus Curetonianus, possibly originated at a later period within Edessa also—the Peshitto, which belongs perhaps to the first half of the fourth century, having arisen, it may be, outside Edessa in Coele-Syria.[1] It was Edessa, and not any town in Coele-Syria, which became the headquarters and missionary centre of national Syrian Christianity during the third century. From Edessa issued the Syriac versions of early Christian literature, and thus Syriac, which had been checked by the progress of Greek as a language of civilization, became at last a civilized and literary tongue.

The Christian city of Edessa, which probably had a larger percentage of Christians among its population than any of the larger towns during the period previous to Constantine, was certainly an oasis and nothing more. Round it swarmed the heathen. A few Christians were indeed to be found at Carrhae (= Harran), a town which was the seat of Dea Luna and contained numerous temples. This we know from the martyrdoms.[2] But in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*,

[1] Cp. Nestle's article on "Translations of the Bible" in *Prot. Real-Encykl.*[3], iii. pp. 167 f.; and Merx, *die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Texte*, ii. 1 (1902), pp. x. f.

[2] No bishop, however, was permitted there. The name of the first bishop occurs under Constantius.

c. 20 (*circa* 385 A.D.) we read: "In ipsa civitate extra paucos clericos et sanctos monachos, si qui tamen in civitate commorantur [in the country districts they were numerous], penitus nullum Christianum inveni, sed totum gentes sunt" ("In the city itself, apart from a few clerics and holy monks, who, however, stay inside its walls, I found not a single Christian; all were pagans"). Cp. also Theodoret (*H.E.*, iv. 15), who describes Carrhae, in the reign of Valens, as a barbarous place full of the thorns of paganism (cp. v. 4, iii. 21, and similar remarks in Ephraem).[1] The existence of Christian churches, previous to 325 A.D., can be verified for Nisibis,[2] Resaina, Macedonopolis (on the Euphrates, west of Edessa), and Persa (= Perra), as the bishops of these towns, together with their colleagues from Edessa, attended the Nicene councils. (For other evidence regarding Nisibis, see Theodoret, *H.E.*, i. 6.)

As regards the spread of Christianity in Mesopotamia and Persia, no store whatever can be set by the statement (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.*, iii. 1, p. 611) that there were about 360 churches in Persia[3] by the second century. There is no doubt, however, that Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* 250 A.D.) not only knew churches in Mesopotamia, but mentioned their inter-

[1] Harran was predominantly pagan even as late as Justinian's reign (Procop., *de bello pers.*, ii. 13). Christianity could never get a firm foothold there (cp. Chwolson, *die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, 1856).

[2] Where Ephraem, the famous Syrian author, was born of Christian parents at the beginning of the fourth century. A Christian school can be shown to have existed at Nisibis not long afterwards.

[3] See Labourt, *le Christianisme dans l'empire Perse sous la dynastie Sassanide* (Paris, 1904).

course and relations with other churches (Eus., vii. 5), while the dialogue of pseudo-Bardesanes ("On the Laws of Countries"—third century) presupposes a considerable extension of Christianity as far as the eastern districts of Persia (cp. Eus., *Praep. evang.*, vi. 10. 46),[1] and Eusebius himself mentions martyrs in Mesopotamia during the persecution of Diocletian.[2] Furthermore, the great Persian persecution during the fourth century points to a fairly serious spread of Christianity in the course of the third century (cp. also the origin of Manichæism and the history of Mani in the *Acta Archelai*, which, of course, are partly fictitious—Archelaus himself being described by Jerome in the *vir. illustr.* lxxii. as bishop of Mesopotamia). Constantine writes thus to king Sapur: "I am delighted to learn that the finest districts in Persia also are adorned with the presence of Christians";[3] and finally, reference must be made

[1] Οὔτε οἱ ἐν Παρθίᾳ Χριστιανοὶ πολυγαμοῦσι, Πάρθοι τυγχάνοντες, οὔθ' οἱ ἐν Μηδίᾳ κυσὶ προτιθέασι τοὺς νεκρούς, οὐχ οἱ ἐν Περσίδι γαμοῦσι τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν, Πέρσαι ὄντες, οὐ παρὰ Βάκτροις καὶ Γήλοις φθειροῦσι τοὺς γάμους, κ.τ.λ. ("Nor are the Parthian Christians polygamists, nor do Christians in Media expose their dead to dogs, nor do Persian Christians marry their daughters, nor are those in Bactria and among the Gelae, debauched," etc.).

[2] The Persians are referred to in Constantine's remark (*Vit. Const.*, ii. 53) that the *barbarians* nowadays boasted of having taken in the refugees from the Roman empire during the Diocletian persecution, and of having detained them in an extremely mild form of captivity, permitting them the unrestricted practice of their religion and all that pertained thereto.

[3] *Vit. Const.*, iv. 13; cp. iv. 8: πυθόμενος γέ τοι παρὰ τῷ Περσῶν ἔθνει πληθύνειν τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας λαούς τε μυριάνδρους ταῖς Χριστοῦ ποίμναις ἐναγελάζεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. ("On learning that churches of God abounded among the Persians, and that thousands of people were gathered into the fold of Christ," etc.).

to Aphraates, whose homilies, composed between 337 and 345, reflect a Christianity substantially unaffected by the course of Greek Christianity, and therefore occupying the same position before 325 as after. They also reflect, at the same time, a vigorous and far-reaching ecclesiatical system. In one or two localities we can definitely assume the presence of Christians before 325, as, *e.g.*, at Amida (= Diarbekir; cp. the Abgar-legend, *Acta Thadd.*, 5; the retrospective inferences are certain),[1] and, above all, at Seleucia-Ctesiphon (as may certainly be inferred from the episcopal lists, which are not wholly useless). The Persian bishop at Nicæa, however, did not come from Seleucia.[2] The existence of Christians at

[1] According to Ebed Jesu, both the bishop of Amida and the bishop of Gustra (= Ostra? cp. Bratke's *Religionsgespräch am Hof Sassaniden*, 1899, p. 264) were at Nicæa.

[2] According to Greg. Barhebr., *Chron.*, iii. 22 f., and other legendary writers, Seleucia had three successive bishops who were relatives of Jesus (!). On Mari, the founder of the patriarchate of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, cp. Raabe's *die Geschichte der Dom. Mari* (1893), and Westphal's *Unters. über die Quellen u. die Glaubwürdigkeit der Patriarchenchroniken* (1901), pp. 30 f.; and on an alleged correspondence of the catholicus Papa of Seleucia (f. 326), see Braun in *Zeitschr. f. kathol. Theol.*, xviii. (1894), pp. 167 f. On Papa, see Westphal, *op. cit.*, pp. 60 f. The personality of this bishop, who died full of years, and perhaps the historicity of the synod which he convened (in 313–314 A.D.), may be regarded as indubitable. His successor was Simeon bar Sabtæ, the martyr. Eusebius describes how at the consecration of the church in Jerusalem there was present one of the Persian bishops, who was a master of the divine oracles (παρῆν καὶ Περσῶν ἐπισκόπων ἱερὸν χρῆμα, τὰ θεῖα λόγια ἐξηκριβωκὼς ἀνήρ, *Vit. Const.*, iv. 43).—The aforesaid Mari may have been some actual bishop and missionary on the Tigris, but legend has treated him as if he were one of the twelve apostles, making him the founder of Christianity throughout the entire Eastern Orient. While the legends, which are connected

Batana, previous to Constantine, may be deduced from the *Silviae Peregr.* 19, and we may conclude from the Acts of the Persian martyrs (edited by Hofmann [1]) that there were also Christians at Harbath, Glal, Kerkuk (= Karkha dh Bheth Slokh), Arbela,[2] Shargerd, Dara, and Lasom. This holds true perhaps (to judge from the *Acta Archelai*) of the village of Diodoris in Mesopotamia as well, and of Sibapolis (where there was a martyrdom).[3] A Christian church

with the central seat of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and which endeavour to throw a special halo round the episcopate as well as to claim apostolic origin for the Nestorian church, are exceptionally full of tendency and audacity, they are nevertheless transparent in their attempt to meet all possible and conflicting wishes (connection with Antioch, with Jerusalem, with Jesus himself; complete independence; and so forth).

[1] *Abh. z. Kunde des Morgenlands,* vii. 3., pp. 9 f., 46 f. 52, 268 (also Nöldeke, in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1880, p. 873, who opines that the first organized Christian church arose on the lower Tigris about 170 A.D.).

[2] The bishop who attended Nicæa probably came from one or other of the two last-named towns (cp. Westphal, pp. 66).

[3] In regard to the spread of Christianity throughout the East, Nöldeke has been kind enough to write me as follows (Sept. 27, 1901). "It is extremely bold to attempt to exhibit the spread of Christianity in great detail, but you have certainly collected a large amount of material. Scarcely any serious aid is to be got from the East, I imagine, as the few reliable sources which are older than the fourth century yield very little, in this connection, beyond what is generally known. Aphraates and the early Acts of the martyrs show, no doubt, that in the districts of the Tigris Christianity was widely diffused, with an organization of bishops and clergy, about the middle of the fourth century; but it is pure legend to assert that these Persian Christians constituted at that period an entire church under some Catholicus. Simeon bar Sabta'e was merely bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon. The erection of churches, which subsequently became Nestorian, did not take place until the beginning of the fifth century, and at a still later

may also be held to have existed at Kaschkar before 325 (cp. Westphal, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

In the third book of his commentary on Genesis, Origen touches upon a tradition that Thomas the apostle took Parthia as his missionary sphere, while Andrew's was Scythia (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 1). From this it may be inferred that Christians were known to exist there by the first half of the third century. The same holds true of India. Of course the India whither Pantænus journeyed from Alexandria (Eus., v. 10) may be South Arabia (or even the Axumitic kingdom). But the India where the early (third century) Acts of Thomas locate that apostle's work, is the N.W. territory of our modern India (for it is only Cod. Pani, 1617, of the Martyrdom of Thomas, that drags in Axum ; cp. Bonnet., p. 87). Andrapolis is mentioned in *Acta Thom.* 3 as the scene of the apostle's labour ; for other localities mentioned there, see Lipsius : *Apokr. Apostelgesch.*, i. p. 280 (after Gutschmid). I pass over the tradition about Andrew, which mentions various localities, as well as the traditions about Simon and Judas. They are all

period the Persian Christian church (whose origin is unfortunately hidden from us) declined to submit to the Catholicus. The stubborn adhesion of the people of Harran to paganism was partly due, indeed, to a feeling of local jealousy of Edessa, which had early been won over to Christianity. It is a pity that none of the original Syriac writings of the pagans in Harran ('Sabians'), dating from the Islamic period, have been preserved." Mesopotamia was the birthplace of the monk Arnobius, who started a religious movement of his own in the days of Arius (cp. Epiph., *Hær.*, lxx. 1).—The figures relating to the martyrs during the persecution of Sapur are quite useless, but it is remarkable to find that here the Jews are still described as the chief instigators of persecution.

posterior to Constantine (cp. my *Chronol.*, i. pp. 543 f.).[1]

§ 6. Arabia.

The large districts south of Palestine, Damascus, and Mesopotamia which bear the name of "Arabia" were never cultivated—they were not even subdued—by the Romans, with the exception, *i.e.*, of the country lying east of the Jordan and of several positions south of the Dead Sea (cp. Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. pp. 471 f.; Eng. trans., ii. pp. 143 f.). Consequently we can only look for Christians during our epoch[2] in the regions just mentioned, where Arabian, Greek, and Roman cities were inhabited by people of superior civilization.[3] Immediately after his conversion Paul

[1] Compare, however, the passage from Origen already quoted on p. 159: "Nec apud Seras nec apud Ariacin audierunt Christianitatis sermonem."—Note that the first Protestant history of missions, published in Germany, was concerned with India, viz., M.V. La Croze, *Hist. du Christ. des Indes*, 1724 (cp. Wiegand in the *Beiträge z. Förd. christl. Theol.*, vi. 3, pp. 270 f.). La Croze, however, hardly touches the primitive age, as he regards the legends about Thomas as unauthentic.

[2] There are no Arabic versions of the Bible previous to Islam, a fact which is the surest proof that in its primitive period Christianity had secured no footing at all among the Arabs. Nor did it ever secure such a footing, for the Arabic versions were not made for Arabs at all, but for Copts and Syrians who had become Arabians.—The original source of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* perhaps arose among the Arabs of Petra.

[3] Mommsen, p. 485 (Eng. trans., ii. 158): "At this eastern border of the empire there was thus secured for Hellenic civilization a frontier domain which may be compared to the Romanized region of the Rhine; the arched and domed buildings of eastern Syria compare admirably with the castles and tombs of the great men and merchants of Belgica." Bostra flourished pre-eminently after the downfall of Palmyra.

betook himself to "Arabia" (Gal. i. 17), *i.e.* hardly to the desert, but rather to a district south of Damascus where he could not expect to come across any Jews.

We have already seen how the Palestinian Jewish Christians settled at Pella and Kochaba.

In the days of Origen there were numerous bishoprics in the towns lying south of the Hauran, all of which were grouped together in a single synod. Bishop Beryllus of Bostra, well known (according to Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 20) for his letters and writings, caused a great sensation, about 240 A.D., by venting a Christological proposition to the effect that no personal hypostasis belonged to the Redeemer before he appeared in time. The doctrine may have been designed to repudiate current conceptions of pre-existence as Hellenic ideas, and thus to give expression to a national Christian spirit (cp. Paul of Samosata's doctrine). But this is uncertain. What is certain (for Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 33, reports it) is that "a large number of bishops" carried on discussions and debates with him, and for these combatants we must look to Arabia especially, although Palestinian bishops may have also taken part in the controversy.[1] Eusebius further relates that a synod was held at Bostra, to which Origen was invited, and of which he was the intellectual leader. Shortly afterwards a second synod was held at the same place, at which the rather untrustworthy *Liber Synodicus* declares

[1] Two years earlier a provincial synod of Arabia had been held, in connection with the proceedings against Origen; it decided in the latter's favour (cp. Jerome's *ep.*, xxxiii. 4). Origen was known personally by that time to the Arabian bishops, for about 215 A.D. he had travelled as far as Arabia at the request of the Roman governor, before whom he laid his views (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19).

that fourteen bishops were present. Origen again was invited, and again attended. The topic of discussion was a doctrine put forward by a section of the Arabian bishops, who held that the soul died and decayed along with the body, and was revived along with it at the resurrection (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 39). The Semitic cast of mind in those who held this view, as well as their aversion to Hellenic speculation (with its essential immortality of the soul), are perfectly obvious. Christianity therefore penetrated such strata of the Arabian population as may be called national —*i.e.* it spread among people who, while they rejected the Christianity of Alexandrian theology, were not barbarians, but worked out a theology of their own.[1]

The Arabian churches were connected with the church of Rome; and they required assistance from it, as we are fortunate enough to learn from an allusion which Dionysius of Alexandria happens to make in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 5.[2]

Both the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and the Acts of the Council of Nicæa indicate the presence of Christians, during the days of Eusebius, in the towns lying east and north-east of the Dead Sea. On Cariathaim (Kerioth, Kurejat; cp. Baedeker, p. 176)

[1] As we may judge from those two characteristic views of doctrine put forward in Bostra and "Arabia," in opposition to the Alexandrian theology. They furnish a strong proof, at any rate, of independence and mental activity among the "Arabian" Greeks. We may rank them with the peculiar buildings, whose ruins are to be found in Bostra, as evidence of a distinctive civilization.

[2] From Optatus (ii. 12) we learn, casually, that there was intercourse also between Arabia and North Africa: "Quid Arabia provincia, unde probamus venientes a vobis [sc. Donatistis] esse rebaptizatos?" ("What of the province of Arabia, emigrants from which, we aver, have been re-baptized by you?")

the *Onomasticon* observes,[1] "Cairathaim nunc est vicus Christianis omnibus florens iuxta Madaba" [cp. Baedeker, pp. 173 f.], "urbem Arabiae." There were present at Nicæa bishops from Philadelphia,[2] Esbus, and Sodom (whose site, so far as I know, has not been discovered). From the north there were the bishops of Bostra, the most important and finely situated city of the whole country, and Dionysias. The Nicene lists further contain, under Arabia, the name of a bishop called Sopater Beretaneus. Where this place lay we do not know, for it cannot be identified with Bereitan (equivalent to Berothai; Baedeker, p. 358), which was situated in Lebanon. One tradition, which is not of course entirely trustworthy, makes an Arabian bishop from Zanaatha (?) attend Nicæa,[3] but nothing is known of such a place. Finally, we may conclude, although the conclusion is not certain, from Epiph. li. 30 that there were Christians at Gerasa. It is impossible to prove that Christians lived in the Nabatean city of Petra earlier than Constantine.[4]

The efforts made to introduce Christianity among the nomad tribes, efforts that were both rare and

[1] "C. is now a village, flourishing and entirely Christian, close to the Arabian city of Madaba."

[2] Epiphanius (*Hær.*, lviii., and Epitome) observes that in Bakatha [Bakathus] μητροκωμία τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς Φιλαδελφίας [or ἐν Βακάθοις τῆς Φιλαδελφηνῆς χώρας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου], the sect of the Valesians resided.

[3] The names of the bishops (Nicomachus, Cyrion, Gennadius, Severus, Sopater, another Severus, and Maron) are all Greek or Latin.

[4] According to Sozomen (vii. 5) the inhabitants of Petra and Areopolis (= Rabba, east of the middle of the Dead Sea) offered a vigorous resistance to Christianity even as late as 400 A.D. As for Petra, Epiphanius (p. 51, c. 223; in Oehler, Appendix, t. ii. p. 631),

rather fruitless, fall outside our period, and consequently must be passed over here.[1] Perhaps we should recall in this connection, the fact that Pantænus travelled from Alexandria to India, *i.e.* to Southern Arabia, about 180 A.D., and that Jewish colonists were living in the latter district (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 10. 3). "He is said to have found there, among some of the inhabitants who were acquainted with Christ, the gospel of Matthew, which had reached that country before him. For Bartholomew is said to have preached to these people and to have left with them a Hebrew version of Matthew's gospel, which they had kept until the time of which I speak."

§ 7. Egypt and the Thebais, Libya and Pentapolis.[2]

The most grievous blank in our knowledge of early church history is our total ignorance of the

after describing the festival of the Virgin who had given birth to the "Æon," proceeds as follows: τοῦτο καὶ ἐν Πέτρᾳ τῇ πόλει (μητρόπολις δέ ἐστι τῆς Ἀραβίας) ἐν τῷ ἐκεῖσε εἰδωλίῳ οὕτως γίνεται καὶ Ἀραβικῇ διαλέκτῳ ἐξυμνοῦσι τὴν Παρθένον, καλοῦντες αὐτὴν Ἀραβιστὶ Χααβοῦ, τοντέστιν Κόρην ἤγουν Παρθένον, καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς γεγεννημένον Δουσάρην τοντέστιν Μονογενῆ τοῦ δεσπότου ("The same thing goes on at the city of Petra, the metropolis of Arabia, in the local temple, where they sing hymns in Arabic to the Virgin, calling her by the Arabic name of Chaabos, *i.e.* Maiden or Virgin, and her son Dusares, *i.e.* the only-begotten of the Lord").

[1] Cp., *e.g.*, Rufin., ii. 6 (=Socrat., iv. 36; Theodoret, iv. 20), Cyrillus Scythopolit., *Vita Euthymii* (ἐπίσκοπος τῶν παρεμβολῶν), and see Duchesne's *Les missions chrétiennes au sud de l'empire Romain* (1896), pp. 112 f.

[2] Politically, Pentapolis (Cyrenaica) belonged to Crete; but I group it thus, inasmuch as ecclesiastically, to the best of our knowledge, it always tended to gravitate toward Alexandria.

history of Christianity in Alexandria and Egypt up till 180 A.D. (the episcopate of Demetrius), when for the first time the Alexandrian church appears in the daylight of history. It is then a stately church with that school of higher learning attached to it by means of which its influence was to be diffused and its fame borne far and wide. Eusebius found nothing in his sources[1] bearing on the primitive history of Christianity at Alexandria; and although we may conjecture, with regard to one or two very ancient Christian writings (*e.g.*, the epistle of Barnabas, the Didachê, the Preaching of Peter, the apostolic canons, etc.), that their origin is Egyptian or Alexandrian, this can hardly be proved in the case of any one of them with clearness.

The following points[2] sum up all our knowledge of the Alexandrian or Egyptian church previous to Demetrius. (i) There was a local gospel, described by Clement of Alexandria and others as "the gospel according to the Egyptians" (εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Αἰγυπτίους),

[1] So that we also know next to nothing of the relations between Judaism in Egypt and Alexandria and the development of the church. It is purely a conjecture, though perhaps a correct conjecture, that more Jews were converted to Christianity in the Nile valley than anywhere else.

[2] Reference may be made to Apollos of Alexandria (Acts xviii. 24), who appears to have joined the Baptist's followers in Alexandria (though this is not certain), and also to the story, told by Justin (*Apol.*, I. xxix.), of an Alexandrian Christian who wanted to be castrated. We should possess an important account (though one which would have to be used with caution) of early Christianity in Alexandria, were Hadrian's epistle to Servian authentic. This is controverted, however, and consequently cannot be employed except for the third century. The passage in question runs as follows (*Vita Saturn.* 8): "Aegyptum, quam mihi laudabas, totam didici levem pendulam et ad omnia famae momenta volitantem. illic qui Serapidem colunt Christiani sunt et devoti sunt Serapidi

but orthodox Christians had already dropped it from use by the end of the second century. The heretical asceticism and Modalism which characterize it throw a peculiar light upon the idiosyncrasies of early Egyptian Christianity. Originally it was not merely used by actually heretical parties, who retained it ever afterwards, but also by the Egyptian Christians in general, as is plain from Clement's attitude, and still more so from its very title. For the latter either implies that the book was originally used by the Gentile Christians of Egypt as distinguished from the local Jewish Christians who read the εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους in an Aramaic or Greek version,[1] or else it implies a contrast between κατ' Αἰγυπτίους and κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. In this event, the gospel would be the book of the provincials in contradistinction to the Alexandrians.[2] (ii) The heretic Basilides laboured in Egypt. Of him Epiphanius writes as follows

qui se Christi episcopos dicunt; nemo illic archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter, non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. ipse ille patriarcha cum Aegyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum. . . . unus illis deus nummus est; hunc Christiani, hunc Judaei, hunc omnes venerantur et gentes" ("The Egypt which you praised to me, I have found altogether fickle, flighty, and blown about by every gust of rumour. There people who worship Serapis are Christians, while those who call themselves bishops of Christ are adherents of Serapis. There no chief of a Jewish synagogue, no Samaritan, no Christian presbyter, but is an astrologer, a soothsayer, a vile wretch. When the patriarch himself visits Egypt, he is forced by some to worship Serapis, and by others to worship Christ. . . . Christians, Jews, and all nations worship this one thing—money"; cp. vol. i. pp. 162, 313, 348).

[1] Clement still used both side by side, but he sharply distinguishes them from the canonical.

[2] Such is the opinion advocated by Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litt.*, i. p. 387, but I do not think it probable.

(*Hær.*, xxiv. 1): *ἐν τῇ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώρᾳ τὰς διατριβὰς ἐποιεῖτο, εἶτα ἔρχεται*[1] *εἰς τὰ μέρη τοῦ Προσωπίτου καὶ Ἀθριβίτου, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὸν Σαΐτην καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ Ἀλεξανδρειοπολίτην χῶρον ἤτοι νομόν· νομὸν γὰρ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοί φασι τὴν ἑκάστης πόλεως περιοικίδα ἤτοι περίχωρον* ("After spending some time in Egypt, he went to the districts of Prosopitis and Athribitis, not but that he also visited the district or nome of Sais and Alexandria and Alexandreiopolis. For the Egyptians give the name of 'nome' to the environments or suburbs of a city"). (iii) Another Egyptian, who probably began his work in Egypt, was Valentinus. Epiphanius (xxxi. 2), who declares that none of the early heretics mentioned his birthplace, writes that only one piece of information, and that of doubtful weight, was extant regarding this Egyptian: *ἔφασαν αὐτὸν τινες γεγενῆσθαι Φρεβωνίτην* [*Φαρβαιθίτην*] *τῆς Αἰγύπτου παραλιώτην, ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ πεπαιδεῦσθαι τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν* ("Some said he was born at Phrebonitis [or Pharbaithis] in Egypt, and educated after the Greek fashion in Alexandria"); cp. also xxxi. 7: *ἐποιήσατο δὲ οὗτος τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὅθεν δὴ καὶ ὡς λείψανα ἐχίδνης ὀστέων ἔτι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ περιλείπεται τούτου ἡ σπορά, ἔν τε τῷ Ἀθριβίτῃ καὶ Προσωπίτῃ καὶ Ἀρσινοΐτῃ καὶ Θηβαΐδῃ καὶ τοῖς κάτω μέρεσιν τῆς παραλίας καὶ Ἀλεξανδρειοπολίτῃ* ("He also preached in Egypt. And one result is that his brood still survives in that country, like the remains of a viper's bones, in Athribitis and Prosopitis, and Arsinoitis, and Thebais, and the lower regions of the coast, and Alexandreiopolis").[2] (iv)

[1] I do not understand this expression.

[2] Other gnostics can also be shown to have been connected with Egypt. But I pass them over here. Apelles, the son of Marcion, stayed for a time at Alexandria, as we know.

From the Palestinian document of 190 A.D., noticed by Eusebius (*H.E.*, v. 25), we learn that the Palestinian church had exchanged letters, for a larger or shorter period, with the church of Alexandria in reference to the celebration of Easter on the same date.[1] (v) Eusebius introduces with a φασίν ("they say") the statement, which may be referred back to the opening of the third century, that Mark the disciple of the apostles preached the gospel in Egypt and founded "churches first of all at Alexandria itself" (ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας, *H.E.*, ii. 16). We have no means of checking this statement. But the expression "churches" (so all MSS.) is very singular. Alexandria was evidently a sort of province. (vi) An Alexandrian list (originally, so far as we know, in the Chronicle of Africanus) is extant, which gives the bishops of Alexandria from Mark downwards; but unluckily it is quite an artificial production, and nothing is to be learned from its contents[2] (cp. my *Chronol.*, i. pp. 124 f., 202 f.). Such is the sum-total of our knowledge regarding the history of early Christianity in Egypt!

Matters become clearer with the entrance of Clement of Alexandria and of the long-lived Demetrius (bishop from 188/189 to 231) upon the scene.[3] But unfortunately the former yields us very

[1] According to the extant fragments of an Armenian epistle, Irenæus wrote once to an Alexandrian Christian (Harvey's *opp. Iren.*, ii. 456).

[2] The same passage mentions local work on the part of Barnabas.

[3] According to Eusebius (*H.E.*, vi. 1) Christians "from Egypt and all the Thebais were martyred" during the persecution of Septimius Severus (202 A.D.). He speaks of μύριοι, "thousands" (vi. 2. 3), which is an exaggeration.

little concrete evidence as to the church. We learn that the church and its school already played a not insignificant rôle in Alexandria, that the school was frequented by pagans as well as by Christians, that presbyters, deacons, and "widows" were to be found in the church, that it counted members from all classes and ranks, and that many Christian heretics disquieted the Alexandrian church. But this is about all, though he does remark (in *Hom.* vi., 18. 167) that Christianity had spread "to every nation and village and town" (κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ κώμην καὶ πόλιν πᾶσαν). Our sources, though not of course entirely reliable, permit us to infer, with regard to the position of Demetrius, that he was the first monarchical bishop in Alexandria and Egypt, the churches hitherto having been governed by presbyters and deacons—an arrangement which obtained in all the larger localities throughout the nomes (not in the main cities) as late as the fourth century. The course of affairs seems to have been as follows. Alexandria at first and alone had a monarchical bishop, who ere long came to rank himself and to act as the counterpart of "the chief priest of Alexandria and all Egypt."[1] This bishop then began to consecrate other bishops for the chief towns in the various nomes. "Like the towns, the nomes also became the basis of the episcopal dioceses, in the Christian epoch" (Mommsen, p. 546; Eng. trans., ii. p. 235). According to one statement, which is not to be despised, Demetrius only consecrated three such bishops, while Heraclas, his successor, created as many as twenty. During the

[1] See Mommsen's *Röm. Geschichte*, v. 558 f., 568 (Eng. trans., ii. 238 f., 249).

third century, indeed, all the leading towns in the nomes came to have bishops of their own (see below), under the fairly autocratic supervision of the metropolitan, whose powers were of a specially pronounced character in Egypt.[1] Towards the close of his life Demetrius held synods (against Origen); cp. Photius, *Cod.* 118: *σύνοδος ἐπισκόπων καί τινων πρεσβυτέρων* (followed at once by the words, *ἀλλ' ὅ γε Δημήτριος ἅμα τισὶν ἐπισκόποις Αἰγυπτίοις*) [a synod of bishops and certain presbyters . . . . Demetrius too, along with certain Egyptian bishops.]

As Eusebius (*H.E.*, vi. i.) informs us that by 202 A.D. Christians were dragged to Alexandria "from Egypt and all the Thebais" (*ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θεβαΐδος ἁπάσης*), there must have been Christians in all parts of the country.

From the writings and history of Origen, a man to whom, far more than to Clement, the whole Eastern church was indebted for its fusion with intellectual culture, ample information (see above, pp. 158 f.) can be gained regarding the external and internal expansion of Christianity even beyond the

[1] Into the origins and development of the organization in Alexandria and Egypt we cannot now enter at any greater length. I do not know what to make of the statement in Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 7, that Alexandria, unlike other cities, never had two bishops. With regard to the metropolitan powers of the bishop of Alexandria, one gets the impression that they were as despotic as those of the emperor in the sphere of politics. Cp., *e.g.*, Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 1: *Τοῦτο ἔθος ἐστί, τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος, Μαρεώτου τε καὶ Λιβύης, Ἀμμωνιακῆς, Μαρεώτιδός τε καὶ Πενταπόλεως ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν* ("The custom is for the archbishop of all Egypt, the Thebais, Mareotis and Libya, Ammoniace, Mareotis and Pentapolis, to have his ecclesiastical headquarters at Alexandria").

confines of Alexandria and Egypt. No doubt, as he concedes to Celsus that the number of Christians was still "extremely scanty," relatively to the Roman empire, we cannot form any extravagant estimates of their number in Origen's native land down to the year 240 (cp. also his statement that Christian martyrs were rare and easily counted); but, on the other hand, as he finds the steady extension of Christendom (even in the upper circles of society) to be so marked that he can already contemplate its triumph, it follows that the number of Christians must have been quite considerable.[1]

The number of nomes or cities in which we can *prove* that there were Christians previous to Meletius, to the Nicene council, and to the accounts furnished by Athanasius, is extremely small, although the

[1] Accurate statistics of the inhabitants of Alexandria were drawn up in connection with the relief of the poor, as is proved by the remarks of Dionysius Alex. (in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 21) upon the great plague of 260 A.D. "Yet people are astonished . . . . at our great city no longer containing such a multitude of inhabitants—even if one now includes little children and very old people in the census —as formerly it could number of those who were merely in the prime of life, so-called. In those days people between forty and seventy constituted so large a majority of the inhabitants that their number cannot be made up nowadays even by the inclusion of people between fourteen and eighty in the list compiled for the purposes of public charity—those who, to appearance, are quite young, being now, as it were, coeval with those who formerly were full of years [so that the dispensing of food was extended to such persons]. Yet, although they see how the human race continues to diminish and waste away, they tremble not at the destruction of mankind which is ever advancing upon themselves." We must accordingly assume that a very serious diminution took place in the population of Alexandria about the middle of the third century.

fault lies solely with our sources of information. They are as follows:—

The districts of Prosopitis, Athribitis, Saitis [Pharbæthis], and Arsinoë (see above). On the last-named, cp. Dionys. Alex. in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 24, where we are told that the chiliastic movement was particularly popular in that district. Its bishop was probably Nepos, whose bishopric (*loc. cit.*) is not named, and Dionysius also mentions "presbyters and teachers" of the brethren in the villages of the Arsinoë nome. Christianity had thus penetrated into the low country.

The Thebais (see above).

Antinoë: where, about 200 A.D., there was a Christian community (cp. Alex. Jerus. in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 11).

Thmuis: from the "Historia Origenis" in Photius (cp. my *Litt. Gesch.*, i. p. 332), it follows that when Origen was exiled afresh by Heraclas from Alexandria, there was a bishop (Ammonius) in Thmuis, whom Heraclas deposed. He was succeeded by Philip.[1] Cp. also Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 9.

Philadelphia in Arsinoë: from the libellus libellatici published by Wessely (*Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Wiener Akad.*, 1894, Jan. 3), it follows that there were Christians here in the reign of Decius.

Alex.-Island, a village on an island of the Fajjum lake (libellus libellatici, published by Krebs in the *Sitzungsber. d. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1893, Nov. 30).

Hermopolis [parva or magna]: Dionys. Alex. wrote to Conon, the bishop of the local church (Eus., vi. 46).

[1] There was an estate of Rostoces at Thmuis (*Martyr. Hieron.*).

Nilus [Nilopolis]: Chæremon, the local bishop, is mentioned by Dionys. Alex. in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 42.[1]

Ptolemais in Pentapolis: Christians lived here, according to Dionysius (in Eus., vii. 6).

Berenicê in Cyrenaica: a local bishop, called Ammon (Dionysius, *ibid.*, vii. 26).

According to Eusebius (*H.E.*, vii. 13), Gallienus wrote to Dionysius, Pinnas, Demetrius, and the rest of the [Egyptian] bishops. Where the sees of the two latter are to be looked for, we do not know; but it is natural to suppose (cp. the sixth canon of Nicæa) that they were the metropolitans of Libya and Pentapolis, who were subject to the chief metropolitan of Alexandria.

Oxyrhynchus: History of Peter of Alexandria; cp. K. Schmidt in the *Texte u. Unters.*, N.F. v. 4, and Achelis, *Martyr.*, pp. 173 f., the latter of whom infers, from the genuine Passio employed in the "Martyr. Hieros.," that the Christians in Oxyrhynchus during the great persecution were still extremely

[1] According to Dionys. Alex. (Eus., vi. 40) there seem to have been Christians at Taposiris near Alexandria as well. In the village of Cephro, "near the desert" (*τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης*), the exiled Dionysius first spread abroad the word of God successfully, according to his own account. In the Mareotic district, where the village of Colluthion (the fresh place of exile appointed for him) was situated, there were no Christians, or practically none, about the middle of the third century, although the district lay close to Alexandria (cp. Dionys. in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 11). There, too, it was he who planted Christianity. Mareotis (for Mareotic Christians, see Dionys., Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 11) is mentioned in a writing of the Jerusalem Synod (Athanas., *Apol. c. Arian*, 85): "Mareotis is a district of Egypt. There never was a bishop there, nor a territorial bishop; the churches over the whole district were under the bishop

few. Only seventeen are said to have been resident there. But from the letter of Peter, published by Schmidt, one gets a different idea of the situation (the town having a bishop, and the presbyters being partly drawn from the better class of the citizens), and this is confirmed by the Passio in question.

According to the prelude of the festal epistles of Athanasius (ed. Larsow, p. 26) there were Christians in the small and the large oasis by 329 A.D. We now know, as of course one might conjecture *a priori* (since the oases served as places of exile), that as early as the days of the persecutions, in Diocletian's reign or even before then, Christians and Christian presbyters were to be found at Kysis in the southern part of the great oasis, and possibly also in other quarters of the same district.[1] Perhaps there were Christians also in Syene (Deissmann, p. 18). And a very large number languished in the dye-factories of the Thebais during the persecution of Maximinus Daza (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 9; *Mart. Pal.*, viii. 1, ix. 1), while crowds of others were taken from Egypt to the mines in

of Alexandria. The separate presbyters had charge of the larger villages, to about the number of ten and upwards"; cp. Socrates, i. 27: Μαρεώτης χώρα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐστί· κῶμαι δέ εἰσιν ἐν αὐτῇ πολλαὶ σφόδρα καὶ πολυάνθρωποι, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκκλησίαι πολλαὶ καὶ λαμπραί. τάττονται δὲ αὖ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ὑπὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ εἰσιν ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν ὡς παροικίαι ("M. is a district of Alexandria. It contains a very large number of populous villages, in which there are many splendid churches. These churches are under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria, and are subject to his city as parishes"). On the Christians in Mareotis, see also Athanas., *op. cit.*, lxxiv., and Epiph., *Hær.*, lxviii. 7 (a number of local churches as early as 300 A.D.).

[1] Deissmann, *Ein Originaldokument aus der dioklet. Verfolgung* (1902), pp. 12 f. [Eng. trans.].

Palestine and Cilicia (*Mart. Pal.*, viii. 13: 130 Egyptian martyrs).

According to one papyrus (Amherst), dating from the days of Maximus, the bishop of Alexandria (264/265–281/282), there was a bishop called Apollonius then resident in the district of Arsinoë; cp. Harnack in *Sitzungsber. d. k. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1890, Nov. 15.

The "Mart. Hieros." (cp. Achelis, *Martyrol.*, p. 143) mentions a martyrdom "in Ægypto in Anacipoli" (?).

The fragments of the correspondence of Dionys. Alex., and the record of the persecutions, give one the impression that the number of Christians in Alexandria was large, and that the spread of Christianity throughout the country, in town and villages alike (Eus., vi. 42. 1), was considerable. Quite incidentally, for example, we find (in Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 11. 17) that "special gatherings" were regularly held "in the more remote suburbs" of Alexandria (ἐν προαστείοις πορρωτέρω κειμένοις κατὰ μέρος συναγωγαί). Egypt (Lower Egypt), after the middle of the third century, certainly belonged to those territories in which Christians were particularly plentiful,[1] although Dionysius (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 7)

[1] By the time of the Decian persecution, Christians were already occupying public positions in Alexandria, and many were to be found among the rich (Eus., vi. 41, vii. 11). Libelli, or certificates of exemption granted to apostates, survive from towns of no great size; but this proves at most the large number of local Christians. Dionysius, in his account of the Alexandrian victims in the persecution (Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 41), distinguishes between Greeks and Egyptians, but Christians were to be found among both classes of the population.

was aware that there were provinces in Asia Minor where the churches were still more numerous.[1]

As regards the Egyptian episcopal hierarchy at the opening of the fourth century, we find ourselves in a particularly fortunate position. The episcopal lists certainly give an extremely imperfect idea of the spread of Christianity in Egypt, as each nome had only one bishop, while many large churches, in town and country alike, were governed by presbyters, and small villages had not even so much as a presbyter. But, on the other hand, we have to take account (i) of the statement made by Athanasius in 303 A.D., that "there are close upon 100 bishops in Egypt, the Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis." See *Apol. c. Arian.*, 1 and 71, in the first of which passages he roundly asserts, while in the second he records, how close upon 100 bishops from these quarters agreed to the resolution of the Alexandrian synod. They were not all present at the synod, but Athanasius was at pains to have the resolutions in his own favour signed even by those who had been absent. Now if there were nearly 100 bishops in these four districts in 339 A.D., their number must have been probably somewhat, though not much, less in 325 A.D. During the last thirty years of the third century, the organization and consolidation of the Egyptian church, like that of so many other churches, was substantially completed.

[1] Practically no information upon ecclesiastical geography is furnished by the history of Egyptian monasticism previous to 325 A.D. The monastic settlement of Pachomius in Tabennisi (not Tabenne Nesus: cp. v. Schubert's *Lehrb. d. k. Gesch.*, i. pp. 405 f.), however, is to be fixed within that period; and we are also told how Pachomius was converted at Chenoboscium on the Nile in the Thebais district. Its site cannot be identified.

(ii) There is also the fragmentary record, compiled by Meletius, of his adherents among the Egyptian hierarchy, and laid by him before the council of Nicæa (325). This list includes twenty-nine bishops (cp. Athan., *op. cit.*, 71); viz., in

Lycopolis,

Antinoë (cp. also Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 7),

Hermopolis (whither Joseph and the child Jesus are said to have fled; cp. *Hist. Laus.*, 8),

Cusæ (= Cos),

Diospolis,

Tentyrae (upper Thebais, in the department of Ptolemais),[1]

Coptus (E. of the Nile, in the department of Maximianopolis),

Hermethes (?) in the Thebais,

Cynos super. (Cynopolis ?),

Oxyrhynchus (in the days of Rufinus, it had twelve churches; "nullus ibi invenitur haereticus aut paganus, sed omnes cives Christiani").[2]

Heracleopolis,

Nilopolis,

Letopolis,

Niciopolis,

[1] It is remarkable that no bishopric within our period is ever assigned to Ptolemais, though it was the second city in Egypt. This omission cannot be a mere accident. The city must have sharply excluded Christianity.

[2] "No heretic or pagan is to be found there: all the citizens are Christians." The continued existence of pagan conventicles at Oxyrhynchus, assumed by Wilcken (*Archiv f. Papyrusforschung*, i. 3, pp. 407 f.), rests, in my opinion, upon a misinterpretation of παγανικαὶ συντέλειαι, an expression which occurs in a document of 426 A.D.

Cleopatris,
Arsinoites,
Leontopolis in the department of Heliopolis (cp. the history of Heraclas, who lived here, in Epiph., *Hær.*, lxvii.),
Athribis,
Bubastus in Pharbethus,
Phakusa,
Pelusium,
Tanis,
Thmuis,
Cynos infer. and Busiris (in the nome of Sais),
Sebennytus,
Phthenegys,
Metelis,
Memphis;

Also a bishop called Agathammon (at Hermopolis parva) "in the district of Alexandria,"[1] besides a priest from Parembolê.

(iii) Thirdly, we have the list of bishops from Egypt, the Thebais and both Libyas, who were present at Nicæa. These came from

Alexandria,
Alphokranon,
Cynopolis,
Pharbætus,
Panephysis,
Heracleopolis magna,
Heracleopolis parva (St Antony came from a small

[1] In the notices of martyrdom during the great persecution, as well as in Eusebius (Dionys. Alex.), some further Egyptian episcopal names are preserved, but the localities are unknown; cp., *e.g.*, the names in Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 13.

village called Coma, near this city; as his parents were Christian, there must have been Christians in Coma about 270 A.D.).

Ptolemais,
Pelusium,
Thmuis,
Memphis,[1]
Nomos Thautites,
Schedia, Antinoë, Lycopolis, } (Thebais),
Ptolemais, Berenicë, Barcë, Antipyrgos, Tauche, Parætonium, Marmarika,[2] } (Libya super. and infer.).

Down to 325 A.D., therefore, we can assume Christians to have existed in about fifty towns (or nomes) of these provinces, more than forty of which

[1] The heretic Marcus also came from Memphis. He went to Spain, where he gained a prominent lady named Agape and Helpidius, an orator, who succeeded for their part in winning over Priscillian (cp. Sulp. Sev., *Chronic.*, ii. 46).

[2] Paphnutius, bishop of an unknown town in Upper Thebais, was also at Nicæa.—Very likely there were Christians, and a Christian bishop also, at Darnis (Dardanis) before 325 A.D., as it was the metropolitan's headquarters for Libya II. during the days of Athanasius.—Immediately after 325 we get evidence for Christian churches (cp. Athan., *Apol.* lxiv.) at the following Egyptian localities, viz., Dikella, Phasko, Chenebri, Myrsinë, Bomotheus, and Taposiris (see above). Hypselis, where Arsenius, the opponent of Athanasius, was a bishop, may be added to the places which possessed a church previous to 325.

were episcopal sees. In Alexandria there was quite a number of churches, and we have actual knowledge of those in which Arius preached, besides those of Pierius, called after the famous head of the local school (cp. my *Litt.-Gesch.*, i., p. 439), and several others.[1] The Novatians also had several churches in Alexandria, which Cyril had ultimately closed (Socrat., vii. 7). The stories of bishops Peter and Alexander of Alexandria, together with the correspondence of the latter, show how commanding a position in the church was enjoyed by the Alexandrian bishop, and thereby throw light upon the strength of the Christian community in that city.—A further proof of the wide spread of Christianity in Egypt is furnished by the fact that it continued to be a power in Upper Egypt at the opening of the fourth century (compare the description of the Diocletian persecution which raged so fiercely in the Thebais itself), and also by the outburst and propaganda of monasticism during the last thirty years of the third century. In Alexandria, more than in any other city and province, the church

[1] Epiph., *Hær.*, lxix. 2: εἰσὶ πλείους τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐκκλησίαι . . . . Διονυσίου καλουμένη ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεωνᾶ καὶ ἡ Πιερίου καὶ Σεραπίωνος καὶ ἡ τῆς Περασίας καὶ ἡ τοῦ Διζὺ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Μενδιδίου καὶ ἡ Ἀννιανοῦ καὶ ἡ τῆς Βαυκάλεως καὶ ἄλλαι· ἐν μιᾷ δὲ τούτων Κόλλουθός τις ὑπῆρχεν, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ δὲ Καρπώνης, ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ Σαρματᾶς καὶ Ἀρεῖος οὗτος, κ.τ.λ. ("The churches in Alexandria are more numerous. There are the churches of Dionysius, of Theonas, of Pierius and Serapion, of Persaia, of Dizus, of Mendidius, of Annianus, of Baucalis, etc.; in one there was a certain Colluthus, in another Carpones, in another Sarmatas and Arius, etc."). Incidentally we learn that Arius secured seven hundred consecrated virgins, seven presbyters and twelve deacons in Alexandria (*ibid.*, iii.), which also serves to show the size of the church.

understood how to set forth Christianity in forms suited to the varied grades of human culture, and this feature undoubtedly proved an extraordinary aid to the propaganda of the religion, although at a subsequent period, of course, the multitude of uneducated Christians overmastered alike the educated members of the church and the bishop of Alexandria himself. The first Christian who, to our knowledge, published his biblical studies in the Egyptian (Coptic) language as well, was the ascetic Hieracas (Epiph., *Hær.*, lxvii.), an older contemporary of Arius, who was suspected as a semi-heretic. Somewhere about the same time, *i.e.* in the second half of the third century, the Coptic versions of the Bible may have begun to appear (cp. Nestle, pp. 84 f., as cited on p. 294), of which the Upper Egyptian appears to be the oldest—a fact which is quite intelligible, as Greek was not so widely diffused in this quarter as elsewhere. There were quite a number of them (three at the least) in the various Coptic dialects, showing how deeply and how strongly Christianity had operated in Egypt. Unfortunately we cannot even here look for any aid from statistics. For who can tell how many of this population of millions were Christians (cp. Mommsen, p. 578; Eng. trans., ii. 259 f.), when the great persecution broke out? Certain it is, however, that the Christians had long ago outstripped the Jews numerically, and by the opening of the fourth century they were over a million strong. Their large numbers are also evident from the fact that during the fourth century there was a comparatively rapid decline of paganism, native and Hellenic, throughout Egypt—apart, that is, from

the cults at Philæ and other outstanding temple-cities (cp. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, i. 3, pp. 396 f., who shows, however, that there were Christian churches even in Philæ by the beginning of the fifth century). The outlying district of Bucolia, no doubt, is reported (Jerome, *Vita Hilarion.*, xliii.) to have been still entirely pagan in the fourth century, while almost the whole of the city of Antinoë was still given up to idolatry in the reign of Valens. These, however, were the exceptions. And that was why inconvenient clerics were banished thither by the emperor (Theodoret, *H.E.*, iv. 15). Other exiled clerics are said, about the same period, to have found nothing but pagans and an idolatrous temple on an island of the Nile (Socrat., iv. 24). But whatever value one might attach to this story, it ceases to be of any importance when one considers the question put by the pagans to the Christians when they landed, "Have you come hither also to drive us out?" (ἦλθετε καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐξελάσαι ἡμᾶς). On the contrary, it thus becomes a witness to the spread of Christianity. Judaism and Hellenism had plainly paved an open way for Christianity in Egypt, and the national religion, with all its peculiarities, which had long ago become quite meaningless,[1] did not possess the same powers of attraction and resistance as certain of the Syro-Phœnician cults evinced.

[1] It is extremely notable how little mention of the Egyptian religion is to be found in early Christian literature. Even Christian gnosticism, so materially influenced by the lore of Syrian and Asiatic rites, hardly betrays a trace of the Egyptian cultus (yet cp. the Pistis Sophia). The latter must have been disintegrated during the second and third centuries, yielding place to Hellenism, and in part to rude household cults.

We know nothing about the early history of Christianity in Pentapolis (Cyrenaica), where a very large number of local Jews had already created an atmosphere for the new faith.[1] But the fact of Basilides being metropolitan of Pentapolis in the days of Dionysius of Alexandria (Dionys., *ep. ad Basil.*; Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 20; Routh's *Reliq. Sac.*, iii.(2) pp. 223 f.), shows that church life had been organized there, with a number of bishoprics (*e.g.* Berenicê, p. 313), by the middle of the third century. The modalistic Christology gained a specially large number of convinced adherents in this district about the same time, and Sabellius came from Pentapolis.

Not until the fourth century did Christianity penetrate the wide stretches of country south of Philæ and towards Abyssinia; cp. Duchesne's *Les missions chrétiennes au sud de l'empire Romain* (1896). All tales relating to an earlier period are legendary.[2]

[1] Irenæus (i. 10) declares that there were Christians in Libya. There is some likelihood that Tertullian's story about the proconsul Pudens (in *ad Scapulam* iv.) was rehearsed even in Cyrenaica previous to 166 A.D., which would prove the existence of Christians there at that period. But the transference is not quite assured. Crete also might be meant; cp. Neumann's *Röm. Staat. u. allgem. Kirche*, i. pp. 33 f.

[2] Which does not exclude the possibility of Christianity having been preached ere this to certain "Ethiopians" on the borders. Origen seems to know of such cases having occurred. He writes: "Non fertur praedicatum esse evangelium apud omnes Aethiopas, maxime apud eos, qui sunt ultra flumen" ("The gospel is not said to have been preached to *all* the Ethiopians, especially to such as live beyond the River"; *in Matth. comment. ser.* 39, t. iv. pp. 269 f., ed. Lommatzsch).

§ 8. Cilicia.

Ever since Antioch had come to be a place of increasing importance, it had exercised a strong and steady influence over Cilicia, the whole province gravitating more and more to Hellenic Syria.[1] This feature comes out in its church history as well as elsewhere. Luke ranks Syria and Cilicia together as missionary spheres; Christian communities arose there contemporaneously with the earliest communities in Syria; Paul, a son of Tarsus,[2] laboured in his native land; and the Cilician churches, together with those of Antioch and Syria, took part in the great Gentile Christian controversy (Acts xv. 23, epistle from Jerusalem to the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; xv. 41, churches in Syria and Cilicia; Paul himself groups together *τὰ κλίματα τ. Συρίας κ. Κιλικίας*,, Gal. i. 21. Ignatius, cp. *ad Philad.* xi., was accompanied on his transportation by a deacon named Philo from Cilicia). At a later period, too, Cilician bishoprics were frequently filled up from Antioch.

Our information regarding the history of the Cilician church down to the council of Nicæa is altogether slender. In the chronicle of Dionysius of Telmahar (ed. Siegfried and Gelzer, p. 67), a bishop of Alexandria parva [Alexandrette] is mentioned about the year 200. Dionysius of Alexandria once or twice mentions Helenus, bishop of Tarsus,

[1] Under Domitian or Trajan even the *Κοινὸν Κιλικίας*, or Diet of Cilicia, met in Antioch.

[2] There was a large number of Jews in Cilicia, and especially in Tarsus (cp. Acts vi. 9, and Epiph., *Hær.* xxx.).

and from the mode of reference we may gather that he was metropolitan of Cilicia. This province must therefore have comprised a considerable number of bishoprics at that period (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 46, vii. 5: "Helenus, bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia, and the other bishops of that district," "Helenus of Tarsus and all the churches of Cilicia"). Tarsus, distinguished as it was for a flourishing school of learning, was at the same time the political capital of the province. Lupus of Tarsus, Amphion of Epiphania, and the bishop of Neronias, all took part in the synod of Ancyra (*c.* 314 A.D.); see also the synod of Neo-Cæsarea, which immediately followed it. Many foreign Christians were deported to the mines in Cilicia (*Mart. Pal.*, x. 1, xi. 6), and the presence of Christians in Pompeiopolis is implied in the martyrdom of Tarachus and his fellows (Ruinart, pp. 451 f.). The epistle of Alexander of Alexandria vouches for a bishopric at Anazarbus; and for a nameless episcopal seat in Cilicia, at the opening of the fourth century, see Epiph., *Hær.*, xxx. 11.

No fewer than nine Cilician bishops attended the Nicene council, as well as one chor-episcopus; viz., the bishops of Tarsus, Epiphania,[1] Neronias, Castabala,[2] Flavias,[3] Adana, Mopsuestia, Ageæ,[4] and Alexandria

[1] According to Amm. Marcell. (xxii. 11. 3) Georgius, the bishop who opposed Athanasius, was born here.

[2] Cp. the unauthentic Ignatian epistles.

[3] Alexander, subsequently bishop of Jerusalem (in the first half of the third century), is said by some authorities to have been bishop of Flavias at an earlier period. But this can hardly be correct.

[4] Cp. the destruction of the local temple to Aesculapius by Constantine; also the *Acta Claudii et Asterii* (Ruinart's *Acta Mart.*, Ratisbon, 1859, pp. 309 f.).

parva.[1] Their numbers, and the fact of the chor-episcopate having already developed within Cilicia, would indicate that a considerable level had been reached in the Christianizing of this province.

§ 9. Asia Minor (excluding Cilicia).

Cappadocia, Armenia, Diospontus, Paphlagonia and Pontus Polemoniacus, Bithynia, Asia, Lydia, Mysia, Caria, Phrygia, Galatia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Isauria.[2]

Asia Minor, and indeed the majority of the above-named provinces, constituted *the* Christian country κατ' ἐξοχήν during the pre-Constantine era. This is a fact which is to be asserted with all confidence, nor are the grounds of it inaccessible, although different considerations obtain with regard to the various sections of Asia Minor as a whole. Here Hellenism had assumed a form which rendered it peculiarly susceptible to Christianity. Here again were other provinces which were barely touched by it, possessing but an imperfect civilization, and therefore forming virgin soil.[3]

[1] The register doubles Narcissus of Neronias and Narcissus of Irenopolis, but the two towns are identical.

[2] Cp. Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. pp. 295 f. (Eng. trans., i. pp. 320 f.), and the copious instructive article on "Asia Minor" by Joh. Weiss in the *Prot. Real.-Encykl.*[3], vol. x.

[3] One must also notice at how late a period the whole eastern section of the province became really Romanized. Avowedly by 100 B.C., but actually not for two centuries later, did the Romans win practical and entire possession of Cilicia. Cappadocia was not secured till the reign of Tiberius; Western Pontus was added under Nero, Commagene and Armenia Minor under Vespasian, etc.

Here, in many provinces, one could find a numerous body of Jews, who, though personally hostile to Christianity, had nevertheless made preparations for it in many a heart and head. Here singular mixtures of Judaism and paganism were to be met with, in the realm of ideas (cp. the worship of θεὸς ὕψιστος) as well as in mythology; the population were open for a new syncretism. Here there were no powerful and unifying national religions to offer such a fanatical resistance to Christianity as in the case of the Syro-Phœnician religion, although there was no lack of strong local sanctuaries, besides several attractive cults throughout the country. The religious life of the land was cleft by as serious a fissure as the provincial and national—which must have been felt to be an anachronism in the new order of things, above all, in that new order introduced by Augustus. Here the imperial cultus established itself, therefore, with pre-eminent success. But while the imperial cultus was an anticipation of universalism in religion, it was a totally unworthy expression of that universalism, nor could it satisfy the religious natures of the age. Culture and manners diffused widely throughout these provinces, where, in the West, trade, manufactures, and commerce flourished. But so far as there was any culture—and in the West it was extremely high—it was invariably Hellenic. Here, more than in any other country, did Christianity amalgamate with Hellenism, with the result that an actual transition and interfusion took place, which, contrary to the development at Alexandria, affected, not merely religious philosophy, but all departments of human existence. This is brought out by the Christian

theology, the cultus, the mythology, and the local legends of the saints. And the evidence for it is furnished in the fourth, and in fact at the end of the third century, by the way in which paganism was overcome. Here paganism was absorbed. There were no fierce struggles. Paganism simply disappeared, to emerge again, in proportion to the measure of its disappearance, in the Christian church. Nowhere else did the conquest and "extirpation" of paganism occasion so little trouble. The fact is, it was not extirpation at all. It was transformation. Asia Minor, in the fourth century, was the first purely Christian country, apart from some outlying districts and one or two prominent sanctuaries. The Greek church of to-day is the church of Constantinople and Asia Minor, or rather of Asia Minor. Constantinople itself derived its power from Asia Minor in the first instance, and from Antioch only in the second. The apostle Paul was drawn to Asia Minor. Ephesus became the second fulcrum of Christianity, after Antioch. That great unknown figure, John, resided here, and here it was that the deepest things which could be said of Jesus were composed. The daughters of Philip came to Phrygia. All the great developments of the Christian religion during the second century originated in Asia, and it was in Asia that all the great controversies were mainly fought out—the conflict between the itinerant and the local organizations, the gnostic struggle, the Christological controversy (Praxeas, Theodotus, and Epigonus all came from Asia), the Montanist controversy, which here and here alone assumed a popular form, etc. Here, too, the synodal and

metropolitan consolidation of the church was initiated.[1]

Even before Trajan's reign we come across Christian communities at Perge (Pamphylia), Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra (Acts xiii., xiv.), as well as at unnamed localities in Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, at Ephesus, Colossæ, Laodicea, Phrygian Hierapolis (Paul's epistles), Smyrna, Pergamum, Sardis, Philadelphia, Thyatira (Apoc. John), and Troas (Acts, Paul, and Ignat., *ad Phil.* xi.). The churches at Magnesia on the Mæander and at Tralles are also earlier than Trajan's reign, undoubtedly (see Ignatius). Nor do these names exhaust the number of towns where Christian communities were to be found at that period.[2] The vigour and the variety

[1] Plainly this organization had not yet become naturalized in Northern Africa, or only in the local Montanist church, when Tertullian wrote (in *de jejunio* xiii.): "Aguntur praeterea per Graecias [under which we must include Asia] illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur" ("Besides, in definite localities throughout Greece there are held those councils of all the churches, by means of which deeper questions are treated for the church's common good, and the entire name of Christ is represented and celebrated with entire reverence"). In Asia the synods were framed on the pattern of the local diets. Their significance for the growth and strength of the Christian cause is brought out by the Licinian legislation, which prohibited them (*Vita Constant.*, i. 51: *μηδαμῆ μηδαμῶς ἀλλήλοις ἐπικοινωνεῖν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους μηδ' ἐπιδημεῖν αὐτῶν ἐξεῖναί τινι τῇ τοῦ πέλας ἐκκλησίᾳ, μηδέ γε συνόδους μηδέ βουλὰς καὶ διασκέψεις περὶ τῶν λυσιτελῶν ποιεῖσθαι* = "Bishops were never to hold the slightest intercourse with one another, nor were they permitted to be absent on a visit to some neighbouring church, nor were synods, councils, or conferences on economic questions to be held").

[2] For the Apocalypse of John never mentions Tralles, Magnesia, or Colossæ. Consequently, it must have also omitted other cities,

of the forms already assumed by Christianity in these quarters are shown by the seven epistles to the churches in the Johannine Apocalypse, by the whole tenor of the book, and by the Ignatian writings. The epistle to Laodicea (Apoc. iii. 17) sets before us a church which had already compromised with the world, and which felt itself to be rich and satisfied. Ignatius mentions the populous character of the church at Ephesus (πολυπληθία, *Ephes.*, i. 3), while the author of the Apocalypse depicts an ὄχλος πολύς, ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο (vii. 9) standing before the throne of the Lamb. A generation earlier, Paul had written an epistle (the so-called "Ephesians") to Asia, whose conception of history implies the glorious experience of Christ's power to unify mankind, and that peace among men which the Saviour came to bring. Christ, not Augustus, is our peace. He it is who made out of twain one, and hath broken down the wall of partition. Thus the language of imperial adoration is applied here to the Redeemer (Ephes. ii. 14).

This sketch may be rounded off by a piece of non-Christian evidence which, however familiar, cannot be valued too highly. It refers to Bithynia and Pontus, two provinces of Asia Minor, where (as the opening words of 1 Peter already inform us) Christians were to be found at an early period,[1] though no further details

even although these had churches of their own. Ignatius, too, merely gives a selection of names. Both he (*Trall.* xii., *Polyc.* viii.) and the address of 1 Peter point to the existence of other churches still in Asia.

[1] This epistle indicates unquestionably that Christianity had spread to some extent throughout these provinces. The counsels of the author definitely presuppose a certain relationship between

can be gathered on this point from the New Testament itself.[1] Pliny's account of them, however (for it is Pliny to whom I have alluded) certainly relates to Asia and Phrygia alike. He informs the emperor Trajan (*ep.* xcvi., *c.* 111/113 A.D.) that persons of all ages and ranks (even including Roman citizens) are implicated in the proceedings taken against the Christians, while several apostates had explained they had been Christians for many years, but were no longer so. One of them affirmed that he had been converted over twenty years ago. Pliny then goes on to say: "Dilata cognitione ad consulendum te decucurri. Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. *Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est;* quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat *prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari* et sacra sollemnia *diu intermissa* repeti pastumque venire victimarum, *cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur.* Ex quo facile est opinari quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit paenitentiae locus" (cp. above, pp. 148-9).

There were reasons why Pliny should represent the spread of the movement in as strong terms as possible; but, even after allowance has been made for

the Christian and the non-Christian population. Not so the Pauline epistles. The local Christians have obviously excited a disagreeable interest in their affairs; they are exposed to the hostility of the provincials, although the authorities still refrain from any action. The epistle belongs, I should say, to the earlier years of Domitian.

[1] In an ancient preface to John's Gospel (cp. the old manuscript of Toledo) we hear of brethren from Pontus.

this, his testimony remains sufficiently remarkable. He cannot have invented the spread of the Christian religion in the lowlands, or the grip which it took of all classes in the population. But who the missionaries were, by whose efforts this had been accomplished, we cannot tell. How well prepared, too, must have been the soil, if the Christian crop sprang up to such luxuriance! In short, we may claim this letter of Pliny as the most outstanding piece of evidence for the advance of the Christian missions along the whole of the western coast.

Pliny does not name any city or locality; evidently he would have had to mention too many. And the Christian writers are so reticent that these gaps in our knowledge remain unfilled. Amisus in Pontus is the only place at which we can prove from Christian sources, with some show of probability, that Christians existed about 100 A.D. (cp. Ramsay's *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, pp. 211, 225).

Between Trajan and the death of Marcus Aurelius,[1] our sources supply fourteen fresh names of towns containing Christian communities, in addition to the seventeen already noted—an infinitesimally small number in view of the large number of new churches which must have been planted throughout Asia Minor during these eighty years. Those named are Sinope on the Black Sea (the home of Marcion,

[1] In this connection one has also to recollect the rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus and the interpolated rescript of Pius to the Diet of Asia (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, xiii. 4), both of which presuppose a not inconsiderable extension of Christianity in Asia. The local Diet is already concerned with Christians. On the other hand, no weight is to be attached to the story told by Lampridius in his *Vita Alex. Severi* 43, about Hadrian and Christianity.

whose father is said to have been the local bishop; Hippol., in Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1), Philomelium in Pisidia (cp. the epistle of the Smyrniote church upon Polycarp's death), Parium in Mysia (for in this connection we may trust the *Acta Onesiphori*), Nicomedia (cp. the epistle of bishop Dionysius of Corinth to the local church in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23), Amastris "and the other churches in Pontus" (the epistle of Dionysius to them, *loc. cit.*; here the metropolitan organization would be in working order by the reign of M. Aurelius), and Hieropolis in Phrygia (however one may view the famous inscription of Abercius, we may infer from it that Christianity had by that time reached Hieropolis).[1] The other eight towns are known to us from sources relating to the Montanist movement, viz., Ancyra in Galatia (Eus., v. 16), Otrus, Pepuza, Tymion [= Dumanli?], (Ardabau) [ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Φρυγίαν Μυσίᾳ = Kardaba?],[2] Apamea, Cumane, and Eumenea, all in Phrygia (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, v. 16. 18). So far as we know, the first synods in connection with the Montanist controversy were held in Asia Minor, although they did not confine themselves strictly to one province.

Before entering into the evidence at our disposal for the several provinces of Asia Minor, I shall briefly put together some data which serve to prove the wide diffusion of Christianity by the close of our epoch, *circa* 325 A.D.

(1) The edicts of Maximinus Daza against Christians, with their declarations that "almost all

[1] The *Acta Pauli* probably testify also to the existence of a church at Myra in Lycia, during the second century.

[2] Cp. Ramsay's *Phrygia*, p. 573.

men" have gone over to Christianity (Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 6),[1] refer mainly to the situation in Asia Minor (and Syria). From the servile petitions of the cities, even of Nicomedia (*loc. cit.*, and ix. 2 f.), asking the emperor to issue a command that no Christian should reside within their bounds or even in their surroundings, we may conclude that the local Christians were not, relatively speaking, a small body. As for Bithynia in particular, this edict of Daza implies the existence of a specially large number of Christians. The petition sent up by the cities had ultimately the effect of prohibiting public worship within the city walls. Perhaps it was not meant to be serious at all; the idea of such petitions was to curry favour with the emperor.[2]

(2) In the speech already quoted (pp. 162–3), which was delivered in Nicomedia, Lucian of Antioch declares that "pars paene mundi iam maior huic veritati adstipulatur, *urbes integrae*; aut si in his aliquid suspectum videtur, contestatur de his etiam agrestis manus, ignara figmenti."

[1] ἡνίκα συνεῖδον, σχέδον ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους καταλειφθείσης τῆς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἑαυτοὺς συμμεμιχότας (cp. vol. i. p. 342, ii. pp. 124 f.); also the edict in ix. 7. 9: σχεδὸν εἰπεῖν τὰ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης αἰσχύναις ἐπίεζε ("Christianity, it may almost be said, crushed the whole world with its shame"). The designation of Christians as τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Χριστιανῶν occurs rather frequently in the imperial rescripts of that period.

[2] Even if one assumes that the petitions were really meant to be taken seriously, with their demand for the formal ejection of all Christians, no light is yet thrown upon the number of Christians. One has to remember, by way of comparison, how strong the Huguenots were in France, when the aim was utterly to root them out. One always reckons in such cases upon the majority abandoning their faith.

(3) The expression, "urbes integrae," is corroborated, so far as regards Phrygia, by Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 11. 1, where we read how an entire town in this province, which was Christian, was burnt during Diocletian's persecution (*ἤδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πόλιν αὔτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὁπλῖται, πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες κατέφλεξαν αὐτοὺς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξί, τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους*).[1] Even eighty years earlier (for so, I take it, we must understand the authority cited in Epiph., *Hær.*, li. 33), Thyatira was practically a Christian (*i.e.* a Montanist) city.

(4) From the *Vita Constantini*, II. i. 2, it follows that there were several churches at Amasia in Pontus during the reign of Licinius. And if there were several in a town like this, which was not in the front rank, we may safely assume that many towns of Asia Minor already contained not one church but many.[2]

[1] "A whole town of Christians, in Phrygia, was surrounded by soldiers when its citizens were inside. Fire was flung into it, and the troops burned it up, with men, women, and children, all calling upon Christ." The sequel is particularly instructive, as showing the extent to which Christianity had become naturalized in the country; even the authorities of the town were Christians (*ὅτι δὴ πανδημεὶ πάντες οἱ τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, λογιστής τε αὐτὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ἐν τέλει πᾶσι καὶ ὅλῳ δήμῳ, Χριστιανοὺς σφᾶς ὁμολογοῦντες, οὐδ' ὁπωστιοῦν τοῖς προστάττουσιν εἰδωλολατρεῖν ἐπειθάρχουν*, cp. p. 191). Lactantius also (*Instit.*, v. 11) mentions the incident: "Unus in Phrygia universum populum cum ipso pariter conventiculo concremavit" ("One burned up a whole town in Phrygia, with its assembly and all").

[2] Throughout the towns it is obvious that the churches generally were quite small; for Licinius (*Vita Constantini*, I. liii.), pleading hygienic reasons, decreed that Christians were to conduct their worship in the open air. On his part, this was purely a pretext for either ridding the towns of their presence or throwing obstacles in the way of their worship.

(5) Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus., *H.E.*, vii. 7) had already described the churches of Phrygia and the adjoining provinces as "the most populous churches." These districts had the largest number of bishoprics and the largest churches in the East—a fact which is confirmed by the council of Nicæa. For although attendance at the council depended upon all sorts of accidental circumstances, so that inferences from it are not quite certain, still the local strength of Christianity in a province which was, comparatively speaking, so remote and wild as Isauria, is clearly shown by its representation at Nicæa of thirteen bishops and four chor-episcopi, drawn from all parts of the country.

(6) Besides the mere number of chor-episcopi attending Nicæa, the Christian inscriptions from the small townships of Phrygia, the story of Gregory Thaumaturgus (see below), the evidence of Lucian, and other sources as well, show still more forcibly that Christianity during the third century had penetrated deeply into the population of the towns and country districts throughout Asia Minor, partially absorbing into itself the native cults.[1]

[1] An admirable and comprehensive work upon the Christian inscriptions of Asia Minor has been written by Cumont: *Les Inscr. Chrét. de l'Asie mineure*, Rome, 1895 [Extr. des Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, t. xv.). True, we cannot prove more than nine dated Christian inscriptions for the pre-Constantine period (besides the inscription of Arycanda, which refers to Christians), but Duchesne and Cumont have shown that internal evidence justifies one in claiming a considerable number of undated inscriptions as pre-Constantine. The dated inscriptions come from Hieropolis, Eumenea, Sebaste, Apamea, Pepuza, and Trajanopolis. On the position of Christians in Asia, Cumont rightly observes (pp. 26 f.): "La paix relative où vécurent ces communautés, n'y laissa pas

(7) Palpably, the reaction under Julian could not get any footing in Asia Minor, owing to the strong hold of the country already won by Christianity. This explains, among other things, why the names of the bishoprics, which we can verify for Asia Minor, determine the actual number of these bishopries still less accurately than is the case with the other provinces. If a large number of the Eastern provinces generally fell under the verdict — a verdict which cannot, of course, be strictly proved—that by about 325 A.D. the network of the episcopal hierarchy had been completed, leaving few meshes to be added at a later period,[1] then Asia Minor comes pre-eminently within the sweep of such a judgment. Still, to avoid the introduction of uncertain data, I shall refrain from adducing, by way of evidence, the diocesan distribution of the Asiatic provinces, since our knowledge of this dates only from a later period. I shall merely add in this connection an allusion to such towns and localities as can be clearly proved to have had Christian communities up to 325 A.D.

grandir comme ailleurs la haine contre l'État romain. On pouvait devenir chrétien et rester bon citoyen; on aimait à faire l'éloge de sa ville natale, on y exerçait des fonctions publiques, on déposait aux archives la copie de son testament, on stipulait contre les violateurs de son tombeau des amendes au profit de la caisse municipale ou du trésor publique . . . . Rien d'étonnant que dans un pareil milieu les idées et les coutumes antiques se soient plus qu'ailleurs mêlées aux convictions nouvelles, que dans la vie journalière on ait cherché un compromis entre le passé et le présent."

[1] There are but few traces of new bishoprics having been founded in the East by Constantine or his sons. Most of the sees had been created previously, it is plain. The main concern of the first Christian emperor was the building of churches (*i.e.* new buildings or the enlargement of old ones), and their equipment.

A. Cappadocia.

This province, which was neither densely populated nor rich in towns, was passed over by Paul. His steps turned westward. But, as 1 Pet. i. 1 implies, there were already Christians in Cappadocia. Seven Cappadocian bishops attended Nicæa, from Cæsarea, Tyana, Colonia, Cybistra, Comana, Spania (= Spalia), and Parnassus,[1] besides no fewer than five chor-episcopi.[2] This proves how deeply Christianity had permeated the population of the country. By about 258 A.D. it must have comprised a large Christian population, for the Gothic invaders in that year dragged off Christians, and even some of the clergy, among their captives. These included the parents of Ulfilas, who were already Christians, and had resided in the village of Sadagolthina near the town of Parnassus (Philostorg., *H.E.*, ii. 5). The story of the father of Gregory Naz. proves also that there was a Christian community at Nazianzus (Dio-Cæsarea) previous to Constantine.[3]

After the second century we frequently come across Cappadocian Christians in other provinces (cp.,

[1] The last-named town is doubtful, however; still, there is no doubt that there were local Christians by the middle of the third century, for such were to be found in the village of Sadagolthina near Parnassus. Perhaps Camulia, near Cæsarea, had also Christians about this time (cp. von Dobschütz's *Christusbilder*, p. 40, p. 14**).

[2] Cappadocian chor-episcopi also attended the synod of Neo-Cæsarea. The bishop of Cæsarea was at Ancyra.

[3] For evidence of Christians, during the reign of M. Aurelius, in the district of Melitene, west of the upper Euphrates, which may be grouped also along with Cappadocia, cp. below, under "Armenia."

e.g., the *Acta Justini* 41, where Euelpistus comes of Christian parents in Cappadocia). Tertullian, far off in Carthage, can even tell of a Cappadocian persecution (cp. Neumann, *op. cit.*, i. p. 70) between 180 and 196: "Claudius Lucius Herminianus in Cappadocia, cum indigne ferens uxorem suam ad hanc sectam transisse Christianos crudeliter tractasset solusque in praetorio suo vastatus peste convivis vermibus ebulisset, nemo sciat, aiebat, ne gaudeant Christiani aut sperent Christianae. postea cognito errore suo quod tormentis quosdam a proposito suo excidere fecisset, paene Christianus decessit" (*ad Scap.* iii.: "Enraged at the conversion of his wife to this sect, Claudius Lucius Herminianus in Cappadocia treated the Christians cruelly. But afterwards left alone in his palace and devoured by disease, he grew fevered with worms eating his vitals, and would cry out, 'Let none know of it, lest the Christian men rejoice and Christian wives take heart.' Subsequently, he came to see his error in having forced some to give up their faith by means of torture. And he died almost a Christian himself").

The bishopric of Cæsarea, the metropolis of Cappadocia, was widely known throughout the church on account of two men, both friends of learning, viz., Alexander and Firmilian. The former (cp. my *Litt.-Gesch.*, i. pp. 505 f.) was bishop at Cæsarea[1] when quite a youth; he was a friend of Clement and of Origen; and as bishop of Jerusalem he died full of years, after having founded a library in Jerusalem. Firmilian, who also was a man of Alexandrian

[1] Eusebius did not know what place it was, but Gregory of Nyssa (Migne, xlvi. p. 905) mentions it.

culture and an ardent votary of Origen (*c.* 230–268), was connected with the most prominent men of all the church, even with Cyprian of Carthage (cp. my *Litt.-Gesch.*, pp. 407 f.). Thanks to his episcopal efforts[1] Cæsarea became a centre of theological culture; and it was here that the learned maiden Julia resided, who harboured Origen for two years and received one or two books from Symmachus. Much information upon the history of the Cappadocian church during the first half of the third century is yielded by Firmilian's letter to Cyprian (*ep.* lxxv.), where we read of synods, persecutions, heretics, and fanatics. Special interest attaches to his account of a prophetess (c. 10) connected with the earlier prophetesses of Phrygia, who stirred up the whole Christian population during the reign of Maximinus Thrax, and even won over to her side a presbyter and a deacon. In the controversy over the baptism of heretics, Firmilian sided with Cyprian. The most famous Cappadocian martyr was Mamas, a simple shepherd (in the days of Valerian?). But unfortunately we have no *Acta* at our disposal.

Alexander and (especially) Firmilian were responsible for the theological importance of the Cæsarean and Cappadocian church. As regards the fourth century, we can even speak of a distinctive Origenist Cappadocian theology, which proved of the utmost significance for the church at large, and in point of fact for orthodox theology itself. Basil and the two great Gregorys were sons of Cappadocia.[2] Withal,

[1] Gregory of Nyssa calls him a "distinguished" Cappadocian.

[2] It is remarkable and instructive to find Eusebius (*Vit. Const.*, iv. 43), in describing the bishops who assembled for the dedication

a popular Christianity developed simultaneously in Cappadocia, which became fused with paganism—as may be deduced from numberless statements and hints scattered through the works of Cappadocians (cp. also the cult of the "Hypsistarii," votaries of θεὸς ὕψιστος), and especially in the letter of Basil to Glycerius (*ep.* clxix. [ccccxii.]).[1] Following in the wake of Gregory Thaumaturgus, their teacher,[2] these Cappadocians well knew how to adjust Christianity to Hellenism in the interests of the cultured, Hellenism being ranked as a preparation for the gospel. They understood how to Christianize the cults. But above all, they knew how to arrange everything in order to promote the might and sanctity of the Catholic church, and how to enthrone it over every form and phase of existing syncretism, thus putting an end to the latter and at the same time perpetuating them in the sense of subordinating them, as local and justifiable varieties of religion, to the authority of the *one* church and of her cultus. Such an achievement would have been impossible, had not Cappadocia been practically Christian by about 325 A.D., even though its Christianity was cleft in twain.

Finally, the church of Cappadocia acquires further importance as the mother of the Gothic and, in part also, of the Armenian churches.

of the church at Jerusalem by their provincial origins, or in grouping them by one distinctive feature, speaks thus of the Cappadocians: καὶ Καππαδοκῶν δ' οἱ πρῶτοι παιδεύσει λόγων μέσοι τοῖς πᾶσι διέπρεπον ("And these were the chief of the Cappadocians, pre-eminent amongst the rest for learned eloquence"). They were the successors of Firmilian.

[1] Cp. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 443 f.

[2] See under the following section.

B. Armenia, Diospontus, Paphlagonia, and Pontus Polemoniacus.

The early history of the church in Armenia, Great and Small, is wholly wrapt in obscurity. Apart from the district of Melitene, it comes before us first of all in the statement of Eusebius (vi. 46), that Dionysius Alex. wrote "to the brethren in Armenia, whose bishop was Meruzanes." In all likelihood Meruzanes was bishop of Sebaste in Armenia Minor, as this town was the capital of the province at the time of the council of Nicæa. From the mode of expression in Eusebius (Dionysius), however, it seems probable that Sebaste was not the only Christian church in Armenia Minor about 200 A.D.[1] As for the district of Melitene, which is to be assigned to the southern section of Armenia Minor, we can verify local Christians in the reign of M. Aurelius, since, as is clear from the story of the miracle of the rain, there were numerous Christians in the Thundering Legion quartered in that district (see above). We may rightly assume (Eus., v. 5) that the soldiers of this legion were drawn largely from the local population, and Eus. viii. 6 proves that Christianity there was very strong (see further the remarks on this passage on p. 289).[2]

[1] I find, among my notes, Nicopolis in Armenia Minor described as a town where martyrdoms prove the existence of Christians before Constantine. But I am unable to give the reference.

[2] The Christian soldier Polyeuctes, who was martyred under Decius or Valerian, also belonged to the Melitene legion (cp. Conybeare's *Apol. and Acts of Apollonius and other Monuments of Early Christianity*, 1894, London, pp. 123 f.; Aubé's *Polyeucte dans*

The period of the Licinian persecution furnishes us with an invaluable source of information for Armenia Minor, in the testament of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste,[1] which shows that Christianity was at that time just as widely diffused throughout the smaller localities of the province as in Cappadocia. There were Christians[2] in Sarin, Phydela, Chaduthi, Charisphone, and Zimara (none of which, except Phydela, can be identified, so far as I am aware), besides other villages which are not named. Even here the Christianity[3] is Hellenic (cp. the numerous personal names), and presbyters rule the village-churches along with deacons.

l'histoire, Paris, 1882; and *Acta S. S.*, Febr. T. ii. pp. 650 f.). If we may credit a remark in what is, relatively speaking, the best recension of the *Acta Polyeuctes*, he was the first martyr at Melitene, so that Christianity must have been able to grow there uninterrupted till the reign of Decius.

[1] Cp. Bonwetsch in *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, iii. (1892), pp. 705 f., and in the *Stud. z. Gesch. d. Theol. u. Kirche* (1897), pp. 73 f.; also von Gebhardt's *Acta Martyr. Selecta* (1902), pp. 166 f.

[2] It is uncertain whether the town of Zela (Pontus) is really mentioned in the Acts, or whether the name has been corrupted.

[3] As the following passage (*Test.* iii.) is almost unique, I shall cite it here: προσαγορεύομεν τὸν κύριν τὸν πρεσβύτερον Φίλιππον καὶ Προκλιανὸν καὶ Διογένην ἅμα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ· προσαγορεύομεν τὸν κύριν Προκλιανὸν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ Φυδελᾶ ἅμα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων. προσαγορεύομεν Μάξιμον μετὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Μάγνον μετὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. προσαγορεύομεν Δόμνον μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, Ἴλην τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ Οὐάλην μετὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. προσαγορεύω καὶ ἐγὼ Μελέτιος τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου Λουτάνιον Κρίσπον καὶ Γόρδιον μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων. προσαγορεύομεν καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ Σαρεῖν, τὸν πρεσβύτερον μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, τοὺς διακόνους μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, Μάξιμον μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, Ἡσύχιον μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, Κυριακὸν μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, προσαγορεύομεν τοὺς ἐν Χαδουθὶ πάντας κατ' ὄνομα, προσαγορεύομεν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Χαρισφώνῃ πάντας κατ' ὄνομα. προσαγορεύω καὶ ἐγὼ Λέτιος τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου Μάρκον καὶ Ἀκυλίναν καὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον Κλαύδιον καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου Μάρκον, Τρύφωνα Γόρδιον καὶ Κρίσπον καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς μου καὶ τὴν σύμβιόν μου

The bishops of Sebaste and Satala (in the extreme north-west of the province) attended Nicæa. The presence of Christians in Melitene is further proved by the martyrdoms; cp. especially Eus., viii. 6. 8, where the remark that the clergy were numerous "in every locality" refers to Syria and Melitene.

One of the most notable facts in all the history of the spread of Christianity is that *Armenia Major*[1] *was officially a Christian country by the beginning of the fourth century.* Eusebius calls the Armenians simply by the name of Christians, and describes the attack made by Maximinus Daza as a religious

Δόμναν μετὰ τοῦ παιδίου μου. προσαγορεύω καὶ ἐγὼ Εὐτύχιος τοὺς ἐν Ξιμάροις, τὴν μητέρα μου Ἰουλίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου Κύριλλον Ῥοῦφον καὶ Ῥίγλον καὶ Κυρίλλαν καὶ τὴν νύμφην μου Βασιλείαν καὶ τοὺς διακόνους Κλαύδιον, καὶ Ῥουφῖνον, καὶ Πρόκλον. προσαγορεύομεν καὶ τοὺς ὑπηρέτας τοῦ θεοῦ Σαπρίκιον (τὸν τοῦ) Ἀμμωνίου καὶ Γενέσιον, καὶ Σωσάνναν μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων ("We hail the presbyter Philip and Proclianus and Diogenes, with the holy church; Proclianus in the district of Phydela, with the holy church and his own people; Maximus with his church, Magnus with his church, Domnus with his own people; Iles, our father, and Vales, with his church. I, Meletius, hail my kinsmen Latanius, Crispus, and Gordius, with their households. We hail also those in the district of Sarin, the presbyter and his people, the deacons and their people, Maximus with his people, Hesychius with his people, and Cyriacus and his people. We further hail all in Caduthi by name, all in Carisphone by name. I, Aetius, hail my kinsfolk Marcus and Aquilina and Claudius the presbyter, my brothers Marcus, Tryphon, Gordius, and Crispus, with my sisters and Domna my wife and my child. I, Eutychius, also hail those in Zimara, my mother Julia and my brothers Cyril, Rufus, Riglos, and Cyrilla, my bride Basileia, and the deacons, Claudius, Rufinus, and Proclus. We also hail and salute God's servants, Sapricius (the son of ?) Ammonius and Genesius, and Susanna with her household").

[1] On the relations between the Syrian and Armenian churches, see *Texte u. Untersuch.*, xxvi. 4.

war[1] (*H.E.*, ix. 8. 2: "In addition to this the tyrant was obliged to make war upon the Armenians, men who had been old allies and friends of Rome. Being Christians and earnest in their piety towards God, this foe of God tried to force them to offer sacrifice to idols and demons, thus turning friends into foes and allies into enemies"). When Constantine recognized and granted privileges to Christianity, he was only following in the footsteps of the Armenian king. Unfortunately the Greek sources for the Christianizing of Armenia are extremely silent (yet see Sozom., ii. 8), while no account need be taken of the late Byzantine or the romancing Armenian chronicles. We merely learn that two bishops from Armenia Major took part in the Nicene council, their names alone (Aristakes, who is said to have been the son of Gregory the Illuminator, and Akrites) being mentioned, not their sees, although the former may have resided at Aštišat, the metropolis. Authentic statements by Armenian historians are infrequent, but we can secure one or two items of information.[2] The headquarters of the Christian mission in Armenia during the third century, and (so far as the mission survived) during the fourth, were Cæsarea in Cappadocia[3] and

[1] τούτοις προσεπανίσταται τῷ τυράννῳ ὁ πρὸς Ἀρμενίους πόλεμος, ἄνδρας ἐξ ἀρχαίου φίλους τε καὶ συμμάχους Ῥωμαίων, οὓς καὶ αὐτοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ὄντας καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν διὰ σπουδῆς ποιουμένους ὁ θεομισὴς εἰδώλοις θύειν καὶ δαίμοσιν ἐπαναγκάσαι πεπειραμένος ἐχθροὺς ἀντὶ φίλων καὶ πολεμίους ἀντὶ συμμάχων κατεστήσατο.

[2] Cp. Gelzer, *Protest. R.-Encyclop.*(2), ii. pp. 74 f.

[3] How strong and far-spread Christianity must have been in Armenia Minor and Cappadocia and the neighbouring provinces at the close of the third century, when the Armenian monarch resolved to elevate it to the position of the State-religion in his country!

Edessa (cp. the reception of Thaddæus, and the Abgar legend), then Antioch and perhaps Nisibis as well (cp. Marquardt, *Zeits. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.*, 1895, p. 651). As a result of this, the Armenians got both Greek and Syrian Christianity, as well as the literature of both these peoples (although all the literature that could come to them from Syria consisted in the main of translations from the Greek). In one or two districts of Armenia, Syriac even became for a time the ecclesiastical language. The great missionary, or rather the great church-founder, of Armenia was Gregory the Illuminator, who had fled before the Persians from his native land. He adopted Christianity (*i.e.* Greek Christianity) in Cæsarea. On the Persian yoke being flung off by the Armenians, Gregory stood by the king, who was only hostile to Christianity at the outset, and Christianity was set up as against the Persian worship. As an exclusive religion it was far better adapted than the cults of Hellenism and the native Armenian faith to safeguard the Armenians against the Persians. The country was systematically and vigorously Christianized. The temple-worship was overthrown. And, by desire of the king (so we are told), Gregory was escorted by a brilliant retinue of Armenian feudal lords on his journey to Cæsarea, where Leontius—the bishop who attended the Nicene council—consecrated him as Catholicus of Armenia. The most sacred sanctuary of the kingdom was destroyed at Aštišat, and the chief church of Armenia, the mother-church of the country, was erected. Twelve bishoprics, it is said, were instituted by Gregory, after the work of conversion had been energetically carried through.

And all this was enacted by the very beginning of the fourth century. By the time the council of Nicæa met, Gregory had died, and (Aristakes?) his son had succeeded him.

The wide spread of Christianity in Pontus about the year 170 is attested by Lucian (*Alex. Abun.*, 25. 38), who writes that "the whole country is full of atheists and Christians." Here (including Paphlagonia as well) there were a number of churches, in the reigns of M. Aurelius and Commodus, which had a metropolitan resident in Amastris. This follows from the letter of Dionysius of Corinth addressed to them (in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ παροικούσῃ Ἀμαστριν ἅμα ταῖς κατὰ Πόντον), and from the part taken by the Pontic church in the Easter controversy (*ibid.*, v. 23: a writing τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο). Of the local churches, we know Pompeiopolis and Ionopolis, whose bishops, together with the bishop of Amastris, attended the Nicene council. There was certainly a church at Gangra, too, about 325 A.D.; for, as the town had a metropolitan *circa* 350 A.D., it cannot have been entirely pagan some twenty-five years earlier. Hippolytus (*Comm. in Dan.*, p. 232 f., ed. Bonwetsch) has preserved for us one episode from the history of Christianity in Pontus, an episode which reminds us very strongly of the incident of the prophetess in Cappadocia and of the Montanist movement in Phrygia, proving at the same time how readily the Christian population of Asia Minor were disposed to take up with such fanatical movements. Unfortunately he does not name the town whose

bishop represented the movement in question.[1] The Novatians were particularly numerous in Paphlagonia (see Socrat., ii. 38), and they had regular churches.

Three bishops from Diospontus attended Nicæa, from Amasia and Comana and Zela. The last-named was also present at the synod of Ancyra in 314. Amasia, even in the days of Gregory Thaumaturgus (*circa* 240 A.D.), was an episcopal see and the metropolis of Diospontus, while Comana had got a

[1] Ἕτερος τις ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ καὶ αὐτὸς προεστὼς ἐκκλησίας, εὐλαβὴς μὲν ἀνὴρ καὶ ταπεινόφρων, μὴ προσέχων δὲ ἀσφαλῶς ταῖς γραφαῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὁράμασιν οἷς αὐτὸς ἑώρα μᾶλλον ἐπίστευεν. ἐπιτυχὼν γὰρ ἐφ' ἑνὶ καὶ δευτέρῳ καὶ τρίτῳ ἐνυπνίῳ, ἤρξατο λοιπὸν προλέγειν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὡς προφήτης· τόδε εἶδον καὶ τόδε μέλλει γίνεσθαι, καὶ δὴ ποτε πλανηθεὶς εἶπεν· γινώσκετε, ἀδελφοὶ, ὅτι μετὰ ἐνιαυτὸν ἡ κρίσις μέλλει γίνεσθαι. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ προλέγοντος, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, μετὰ κλαυθμῶν καὶ ὀδυρμῶν ἐδέοντο τοῦ κυρίου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχοντες τὴν ἐπερχομένην τῆς κρίσεως ἡμέραν. καὶ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤγαγεν φόβος καὶ δειλία τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ὥστε ἐᾶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς χώρας καὶ τοὺς ἀγροὺς ἐρήμους, τά τε κτήματα αὐτῶν οἱ πλείους κατεπώλησαν. ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· ἐὰν μὴ γένηται καθὼς εἶπον, μηκέτι μηδὲ ταῖς γραφαῖς πιστεύσητε, ἀλλὰ ποιεῖτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ὃ βούλεται . . . . αἱ δὲ γραφαὶ ἐφάνησαν ἀληθεύουσαι, οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ εὑρέθησαν σκανδαλιζόμενοι, ὥστε λοιπὸν τὰς παρθένους αὐτῶν γῆμαι καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπὶ τὴν γεωργίαν χωρῆσαι· οἱ δὲ εἰκῇ τὰ ἑαυτῶν κτήματα πωλήσαντες εὑρέθησαν ὕστερον ἐπαιτοῦντες. "Likewise was it with another one in Pontus, himself a leader of the church, who was pious and humble-minded but did not adhere close enough to the Scriptures, giving more credit to visions which he saw. For chancing to have three dreams, one after another, he proceeded to address the brethren as a prophet, saying, 'I saw this,' 'This will come to pass.' Then on being proved wrong he said, 'Know, my brethren, that the judgment will take place after the space of one year.' So, when they heard his address, how that 'the day of the Lord is at hand,' with tears and cries they besought the Lord night and day, having before their eyes the imminent day of judgment. And to such a pitch were the brethren worked up by fear and terror, that they deserted

bishop from Gregory (cp. Gregory of Nyssa; *Vita Gregorii*, c. 19 f.).[1] The church of Sinope in Diospontus was founded as early as the beginning of the second century. Marcion (cp. p. 332) came from there, and it is obvious from the account of the persecution of Licinius (*Vit. Const.*, ii. 2.; *H.E.*, x. 8. 15, "Amasia and the rest of the churches in Pontus") that there were several episcopal churches in Diospontus before 325 A.D.

The life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, which has just been mentioned, is thrown by its author, Gregory of Nyssa, into the form of an oration;[2] but it supplies us with some excellent information upon the Christianizing of the western part of Pontus Polemoniacus, and at the same time with a particularly instructive sketch of the way in which the mission was carried

their fields and lands [being evidently a country church], most of them selling off their property. Then said he to them, 'If it does not happen as I have said, never trust the Scriptures again, but let each of you live as he likes.' The year, however, passed without the prophesied event occurring. The prophet was proved to be a liar, but the Scriptures were shown to be true, and the brethren found themselves stumbling and scandalized. So that afterwards their maidens married and the men went back to their husbandry, while those who had sold off their goods in haste were ultimately found begging."

[1] "All the citizens" of Comana are alleged to have besought Gregory to establish a church. He gave them Alexander, a philosopher and ascetic, for a bishop. An "episcopus Comanorum" is said by Palladius to have been martyred along with Lucian at Nicomedia (Ruinart, p. 529).

[2] Migne, vol. xlvi. pp. 893 f.; cp. also Rufinus's Church-History (vii. 25), the Syriac "Narrative of Gregory's exploits," and Basil, *de spiritu* lxxiv.

out, and of how paganism was "overcome"—*i.e.* absorbed.

Gregory, the Worker of Wonders, was born of pagan parents in Neo-Cæsarea, but was converted by Origen. Striking up a fast friendship with Firmilian of Cappadocia, he returned to his native place and was consecrated bishop of Neo-Cæsarea about 240 A.D. by Phædimus, the bishop of Amasia. At that time there were only seventeen Christians in the town and its environs. When he died (shortly before 270 A.D.) there is said to have been only the same number of pagans to be seen within the town.[1] Certainly the Christianizing of the town and country was carried out most completely.[2] Gregory succeeded because he set up Christian miracles in opposition to those of paganism,[3] because he had the courage to expose the cunning and trickery of the pagan priests, and because he let the rude multitude enjoy their festivals still in Christian guise. "The preaching of the gospel made its way in all directions, the doctrine of mysteries operated powerfully, and the aspiration for what was good increased, as the priesthood got introduced in every quarter." As was customary in the country, Gregory held assemblies in the open air.

[1] Gregory carefully explored, not long before he died, the whole of the surrounding country, to find out if there were any who had not accepted the faith. On discovering that there were not more than seventeen, he "thanked God that he had left his successor as many idolaters as he had found Christians when he himself began."

[2] Athenodorus also took part in the work. He was Gregory's brother, and bishop of some unknown place in Pontus.

[3] Mary and John appeared to him, and he turned such visions to good account.

During the Decian persecution, "as that great man understood well the frailty of human nature, recognizing that the majority were incapable of contending for their religion unto death, his counsel was that *the church might execute some kind of retreat before the fierce persecution.*" Personally, he too fled. "After the persecution was over, when it was permissible to address oneself to Christian worship with unrestricted zeal, he again returned to the city, and, by travelling over all the surrounding country, increased the people's ardour for worship in all the churches by holding a solemn commemoration in honour of those who had contended for the faith. Here one brought bodies of the martyrs, there another. So much so, that the assemblies went on for the space of a whole year, *the people rejoicing in the celebration of festivals in honour of the martyrs.* This also was one proof of his great sagacity, viz., that while he completely altered the direction of everyone's life in his own day, turning them into a new course altogether, and *harnessing them firmly to faith and to the knowledge of God, he slightly lessened the strain upon those who had accepted the yoke of the faith, in order to let them enjoy good cheer in life. For as he saw that the raw and ignorant multitude adhered to idols on account of bodily pleasures, he permitted the people—so as to secure the most vital matters, i.e. the direction of their hearts to God instead of to a vain worship—permitted them to enjoy themselves at the commemoration of the holy martyrs, to take their ease, and to amuse themselves, since life would become more serious and earnest naturally in process of time, as the Christian faith came to assume more control of it.*" Gregory is the

sole missionary we know of, during these first three centuries, who employed such methods;[1] the cult of the martyrs, with its frenzied pagan joy in festivals, took the place of the old local cults. Undoubtedly the method proved an extraordinary success. The country became Christian. A sphere which had been overlooked at the outset of the mission, rapidly made up lost ground, and the country ranked along with the provinces of Asia Minor, which had been Christianized at an earlier period, as substantially

[1] On the blending of religions in Asia, cp. also *Texte u. Untersuch.*, N.F. iv. 1 (Marutas, pp. 11 f.).—Gregory's exploits and testimony are subsequently applied by Theodoret to the church at large (*Graec. affect. curat.*, viii. *fin.*, opp. ed. Schulze, iv. pp. 923 f.), but without any of Gregory's naïveté and without his naïve attitude towards the festivals: *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνων παντελῶς διελύθη τεμένη, ὡς μηδὲ σχημάτων διαμεῖναι τὸ εἶδος, μηδὲ τῶν βωμῶν τὸν τύπον τοὺς νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἐπίστασθαι· αἱ δὲ τούτων ὕλαι καθωσιώθησαν τοῖς τῶν μαρτύρων σηκοῖς. τοὺς γὰρ οἰκείους νεκροὺς ὁ δεσπότης ἀντεισῆξε τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς· καὶ τοὺς μὲν φρούδους ἀπέφηνε, τούτοις δὲ τὰ ἐκείνων ἀπένειμε γέρα. ἀντὶ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Πανδίων καὶ Διασίων καὶ Διονυσίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὑμῶν ἑορτῶν Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Σεργίου καὶ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Λεοντίου καὶ Παντελεήμονος καὶ Ἀντωνίνου καὶ Μαυρικίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτύρων ἐπιτελοῦνται δημοθοινίαι, καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς πάλαι πομπείας καὶ αἰσχρουργίας καὶ αἰσχρορρημοσύνης σώφρονες ἑορτάζονται πανηγύρεις* ("For the glebes of those idols were utterly destroyed, so that not even the very form of their statues remains, nor do people of this age know the shape of the altars. Their graves were also devoted to the sepulchres of the martyrs. For the proprietor substituted the corpses of his own family for your gods, showing plainly that the latter were gone, and conferring on the former the honours which had pertained to their predecessors. For instead of the Pandia, Diasia, Dionysia, and the rest of your festivals, the feasts of Peter, Paul, Thomas, Sergius, Marcellus, Leontius, Panteleemon, Antoninus, Mauricius, and the other martyrs are celebrated; and instead of the former ribaldry, obscenity, and foul language, orderly assemblies now keep feast"). Cp. also pp. 921 f., where the martyrs, in all emergencies (and Theodoret enumerates dozens

Christian. In 315 (or thereabouts) a large synod was held at Neo-Cæsarea, whose Acts are extant.[1]

Christianity also penetrated the Greek towns on the coasts of western Pontus Polemoniacus before 325 A.D. The bishops of Trapezuntum, and even of remote Pityus, were at Nicæa. Already there may have been some Christians among the Iberians (Georgians); but the conversion of this nation did not begin till after the great council, being carried on partly by the cities already mentioned, partly from Armenia, and partly across Armenia from Syria (Theodoret, *H.E.*, i. 23).

C. Bithynia.

After we pass the authentic and surprising testimony furnished by Pliny to the wide diffusion of

of cases; unproductiveness, dangers in travel, etc.), appear as semi-divine helpers who are to be invoked. Perhaps, too, we should see the acceptance of a pagan custom in the statements of *Acta Archel.* ii., where a Christian explains the following custom to the Christians of his own country, near Edessa: "Est nobis mos huiusmodi patrum nostrorum in nos traditione descendens, quique a nobis observatus est usque ad hunc diem: per annos singulos extra urbem egressi una cum conjugibus ac liberis supplicamus soli et invisibili deo, imbres ab eo satis nostris et frugibus obsecrantes" ("Our fathers had a custom of this kind, which has come down to us and which we still observe: every year we all go outside the city, with our wives and children, to pray to the one, invisible God, and to beseech him for enough rain for ourselves and our crops"). The subsequent words show that they fasted and spent the night there.

[1] Cp. Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*[2], iv. pp. 179 f. The legislation restricting the powers of the chor-episcopi (and chor-priests), which had begun shortly before at Ancyra (see below), was carried forward at Neo-Cæsarea (cp. the 13th canon). Some of the bishops who attended Ancyra (314 A.D.) were also at this synod, together with two Cappadocian chor-episcopi.

Christianity in this province (see above), we practically come upon no further traces of it till the age of Diocletian. All we know is that Dionysius of Corinth addressed a letter to the church of Nicomedia about 170 A.D., warning it against the heresy of Marcion (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 24), and also that Origen spent some time here (*ep. Orig. ad Jul. Afric.*) about the year 240 A.D. The outbreak of Diocletian's persecution, however, reveals Nicomedia as a semi-Christian city, the imperial court itself being full of Christians.[1] From the numerous martyrdoms, as well as, above all, from the history of Nicomedia during the age of Constantine and his sons, we are warranted in holding that this metropolis must have been a centre of the church. The calendar of the majority of churches goes back to the festal calendar of the church of Nicomedia. And what holds true of the capital, holds true of the towns throughout the province; all were most vigorously Christianized. Constantine located his

[1] Maximinus Daza, in a rescript (Eus., *H.E.*, ix. 9. 17), also testifies to the very large number of Christians in Nicomedia and the province of Bithynia: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ὅτε τῷ παρελθόντι ἐνιαυτῷ εὐτυχῶς ἐπέβην εἰς τὴν Νικομήδειαν . . . . ἔγνων πλείστους τῆς αὐτῆς θρησκείας ἄνδρας ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς μέρεσιν οἰκεῖν ("Afterwards, when I went up last year to Nicomedia, I found that a large number of people belonging to this religion resided in these regions"). I may point out also that both of the contemporary writers who attacked Christianity appeared in Bithynia; cp. Lactantius, *Inst.*, v. 2, "Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias litteras accitus docerem, ... duo exstiterunt ibidem, qui jacenti et abjectae veritati insultarent" ("When I was teaching rhetoric in Bithynia, by invitation, two men were there, who trampled down the truth as it lay prostrate and low"). The one was Hierocles, but the other's name is not given.

new capital at Constantinople, for the express reason that the opposite province was so rich in Christians, while the same consideration dictated without doubt the choice of Nicæa as the meeting-place of the famous council. At the same time, apart from Nicomedia, not a single Christian community in Bithynia can be heard of before the great persecution, *i.e.* before 325 A.D.[1] The reason for this, however, is that no prominent bishop or author was vouchsafed to that country, while, on the other hand, the council of Nicæa testifies to the existence of episcopal churches at the towns of Nicæa, Chalcedon,[2] Kius, Prusa, Apollonias, Prusa (another), Adriani, and Cæsarea, besides Nicomedia itself. In the country, also, there were episcopal churches, as is shown by the presence of two chor-episcopi at Nicæa.[3] The Novatians had churches also in Bithynia, at Nicomedia (cp. Socrat., i. 13, iv. 28) and Nicæa (*ibid.*, iv. 28, vii. 12. 25); and it follows from *Vita Const.* iv. 43 that there was a particularly large number of bishops in Bithynia.

[1] If, however, as is highly probable, "Apamea" is to be read for "Aprima" in the *Acta Tryphonis et Respicii* (Ruinart's *Acta Mart.*, Ratisbon, 1859, pp. 208 f.), we must presuppose a Christian church at Apamea (Bithynia), though these two saints came not from the town itself but "de Apameae finibus de Sansoro [Campsade ?] vico" (from the borders of Apamea, from a village called Sansorus). They show how Christianity survived in the country districts of Bithynia as well.

[2] Local martyrdoms are reported, as at Nicæa.

[3] There was a Christian community also at Drepana (= Helenopolis; cp. *Vit. Const.*, iv. 61), and there were Christians at a city called Parethia (?) on the Hellespont (cp. *Mart. Jer.*, Achelis, p. 117), which cannot be identified.

D. Galatia, Phrygia, and Pisidia (with Lycaonia).

In their Christian capacity these central provinces of Asia Minor, whose boundaries or titles were frequently altered,[1] had a common history, although S.W. Phrygia gravitated towards Asia.[2] The Montanist movement, which arose in Phrygia proper, and, blending with the Novatian movement, forthwith became national, was particularly characteristic of these provinces.[3] The Phrygian character shows a peculiar mixture of wild enthusiasm and seriousness. Thus Socrates, who was favourable to them, writes (*H.E.*, iv. 28): Φαίνεται τὰ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη σωφρονέστερα εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ σπανιάκις Φρύγες ὀμνύουσιν· ἐπικρατεῖ γὰρ τὸ μὲν θυμικὸν παρὰ Σκύθαις καὶ Θραξί, τῷ δὲ ἐπιθυμητικῷ οἱ πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον τὴν οἴκησιν ἔχοντες πλέον δουλεύουσι· τὰ δὲ Παφλαγόνων καὶ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη πρὸς οὐδέτερον τούτων ἐπιρρεπῶς ἔχει· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἱπποδρομίαι οὐδὲ θέατρα σπουδάζονται νῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς . . . . ὡς μύσος ἐξαίσιον παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡ πορνεία νομίζεται ("The Phrygians appear to be more temperate than other nations.

[1] The names of Phrygia and Galatia were often employed in a broader or a narrower sense, without any regard to the legally existing political divisions. I refrain here from entering into the question of what "Galatia" means in Paul and elsewhere.

[2] The epistle of the churches at Lyons and Vienna (177/178), narrating their sufferings, is addressed to the churches of Asia and Phrygia. We may perhaps assume that Phrygia here means simply the S.W. section.

[3] Wherever the movement spread throughout the empire, it was known as the "Phrygian" or Cataphrygian movement. There was a Montanist-Novatian church in Phrygia, with numerous bodies, in the fifth century (Socrat., iv. 28, v. 22, etc.).

They swear but seldom. Whereas the Scythians and the Thracians are naturally of a passionate disposition, whilst the inhabitants of the East are prone by nature to sensuality. The Paphlagonians and Phrygians, on the other hand, are not inclined to either of these vices, nor are the circus and theatre in vogue with them at the present day. . . . As for fornication, they reckon that a gross enormity"). The Phrygians described here were already Christians. Their wild religious enthusiasm was restrained, but the seriousness remained.[1] Before Montanus was converted, he had been a priest of Cybele. Movements such as that initiated by him[2] had occurred, as we have seen, in Cappadocia and Pontus; but Montanus and his prophetesses knew how to invest their movement with power and permanence, by erecting for it at once a firm organization. In these inland parts primitive Christianity survived longer than elsewhere. The third century still furnishes us with instances of teachers, as well as prophets, being drawn from the ranks of the laity; and in a letter written *circa* 218 by Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoktistus of Cæsarea, in connection with the case of Origen, we read that "Wherever people able to profit the brethren are to be found, they are exhorted by the holy bishops to address the people; as, for

[1] The enthusiastic and wild Messalians emerged at a later period in Asia Minor.

[2] According to Theodoret (*hær. fab.*, iii. 6) Montanism was rejected by Pontus Polemoniacus, Helenopontus, Armenia, Cappadocia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Pamphilia, Lycia, and Caria. This means that no Montanists were to be found there when Theodoret wrote, so that—apart from Pisidia—these regions probably never had very many of them at all.

example, Euelpis in Laranda (Isauria) by Neon, Paulinus in Iconium (Pisidia) by Celsus, and Theodorus by Atticus in Synnada (Phrygia), all of whom are our blessed brethren. Probably this has also been done in other places unknown to us" (*ὅπου εὑρίσκονται οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι πρὸς τὸ ὠφελεῖν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ παρακαλοῦνται τῷ λαῷ προσομιλεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων, ὥσπερ ἐν Λαράνδοις Εὔελπις ὑπὸ Νέωνος καὶ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ Παυλῖνος ὑπὸ Κέλσου καὶ ἐν Συννάδοις Θεόδωρος ὑπὸ Ἀττικοῦ τῶν μακαρίων ἀδελφῶν. εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, ἡμᾶς δὲ μὴ εἰδέναι*). Lay-teachers like Euelpis, Paulinus, and Theodorus did not exist any longer in Palestine or Egypt; as is plain from the Palestinian bishops having to go to the interior of Asia for examples of this practice.[1]

Almost from the very moment of its rise, the Montanist movement indicates a very wide extension of Christianity throughout Phrygia and the neighbouring districts of Galatia; even in small localities Christians were to be met with.[2] Our knowledge on this point has been enlarged during the last twenty years by Ramsay's thoroughgoing investigations of the whole country; thanks to his meritorious volumes, we are better acquainted with the extant inscriptions and the topography of Phrygia than with any other province in the interior of Asia Minor. We have learnt from them how widely Judaism[3] and

[1] This passage [cp. vol. i. p. 453] also is an excellent proof of how well known the churches were to one another.

[2] The first village, known to us by name, which had a Christian community (by 170 A.D.), is Cumane in Phrygia. Pepuza and Tymion were also small centres.

[3] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, pp. 667 f.: "Akmonia, Sebaste, Eumeneia, Apameia, Dokimion, and Iconium, are the cities where we can identify Jewish inscriptions, legends, and names."

Christianity were diffused, locally, in the earliest periods, and we have been taught to distinguish and make ourselves familiar (even within Galatia and Phrygia) with those districts where Christianity found but a meagre access.

With great rapidity the Montanist movement flowed over into Galatia and Ancyra on the one side,[1] and into Asia upon the other.[2] The synods held by the church party, in order to defend themselves against the new prophets, were got up by churches belonging to the central provinces, and in fact were attended by representatives from the most distant quarters of the country (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 19). A few decades afterwards, when these churches were agitated by the question of the validity of heretical baptism, large synods were held at Iconium and Synnada (between 230 and 235), attended by bishops from Phrygia, Galatia, Cilicia, and the rest of the neighbouring provinces (Cappadocia).[3] Firmilian

[1] The anti-Montanist (in Eus., v. 16. 4) found the church of Ancyra wholly carried away by Montanism.

[2] Thyatira fell entirely into their hands (Epiph., *Hær.*, li. 33).

[3] Cp. Firmilian (Cyp., *ep.* lxxv. 7. 19): "Quod totum nos iam pridem in Iconio, qui Phrygiae locus est, collecti in unum convenientibus ex Galatia et Cilicia et ceteris proximis regionibus confirmavimus" ("All of which we have long since established in our common gathering at Iconium, a place in Phrygia, gathering from Galatia and Cilicia and the rest of the neighbouring provinces"): "Plurimi simul convenientes in Iconio diligentissime tractavimus" ("The majority of us have carefully handled this, gathering together in Iconium"). Dionys. Alex. (in Eus., vii. 7: *μεμάθηκα καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι μὴ νῦν οἱ ἐν Ἀφρίκῃ μόνον τοῦτο παρεισήγαγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ πολλοῦ κατὰ τοὺς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπους ἐν ταῖς πολυανθρωποτάταις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ταῖς συνόδοις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Ἰκονίῳ καὶ Συννάδοις καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς τοῦτο ἔδοξεν*): "I also learnt that this was not a recent practice introduced by those in Africa alone, but that long

and Dionys. Alex., who give some account of them, speak of numerous bishops, but they give no numbers. Augustine, on the other hand, following some source which is unknown to us, declares that there were fifty bishops in Iconium alone. A remarkable number!

In the following pages I shall give a list of places in Galatia, Phrygia, and Pisidia where we know Christians were to be found.

Galatia:—

Ancyra, the metropolis; cp. the anti-Montanist in Eus. v. 16. The *Acta Theodoti* give an extremely vivid sketch of the church during the great persecution,[1] and at the same time warn us against extravagant ideas about the size of the church. It was ruled by the huckster Theodotus, and apart from the church or churches there were but two oratories in the town, a *μαρτύριον τῶν πατριαρχῶν* and a *μ. τῶν πατέρων* (c. xvi.); but Franchi has rendered it highly probable that the second case is one of an unconsecrated pagan shrine. The local saint Sosander was perhaps a reconsecrated hero (c. xix.). A large synod was held here in 314, whose Acts are still extant.[2]

ago, in the days of the bishops who were before us, it was resolved upon by the most populous churches, and by synods of the brethren at Iconium and Synnada, and by many others."

[1] Edited for the first time in a trustworthy form, with a commentary, by Franchi de Cavalieri (Rome, 1902).

[2] Cp. Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.*[(2)], iv. pp. 113 f. Of the twenty-five canons of this synod, two bear specially on the history of the local expansion of Christianity, viz., the 13th and the 24th. The former contains regulations for the chor-episcopi, delimiting their powers (for the first time in their history), while the latter is a prohibition of certain pagan superstitions (*οἱ καταμαντευόμενοι καὶ ταῖς συνηθείαις τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐξακολουθοῦντες ἢ εἰσάγοντές τινας εἰς τοὺς ἑαυτῶν οἴκους ἐπὶ*

Malus (a village near Ancyra, *τῆς πόλεως ἀπῳκισμένον σημείων μικροῦ πρὸς τεσσαράκοντα* = "distant all but forty miles from the city," *Acta Theod.* x., etc.) seems to have been entirely Christian. Its small Christian community was controlled by one presbyter, and remained unmolested during the persecution which raged in the metropolis.

Medicones (a village near Ancyra, *Acta Theod.* x.; here also there seem to have been Christians).

Tavium (a bishopric: Nicæa).

Gadamana [= Ekdaumana] (a bishopric: Nicæa).

Kina [?] (a bishopric: Nicæa).

Juliopolis (a bishopric: the bishop was present at Ancyra in 314 A.D. and at Nicæa).

Phrygia[1]:—

Laodicea (the metropolis: cp. Paul's epistles, the local controversy on the Paschal question, Melito in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 26. 3 [cp. v. 24. 5], and the council of Nicæa).

Hierapolis (Paul; the evangelist Philip and his daughters; Papias; Apollinaris of Hierapolis; Eus., iii. 31, 36, 39, iv. 26, v. 19, 24; Nicæa).

Colossæ (Paul).

ἀνευρέσει φαρμακειῶν ἢ καὶ καθάρσει, κ.τ.λ.). Eighteen bishops signed these resolutions, viz., the bishops of Syrian Antioch, Ancyra, Cæsarea (Cappad.), Tarsus, Amasia, Juliopolis (Gal.), Nicomedia, Zela (Pont.), Iconium, Laodicea (Phryg.), Antioch (Pisid.), Perga, Neronias, Epiphania, and Apamea (Syr.), though not all of these localities can be proved indubitably. Galatia, Syria, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Diospontus, Bithynia, Pisidia, Phrygia, Pamphilia (perhaps Cyprus as well), were thus represented.

[1] Duchesne (*Orig. du culte*, p. 11) rightly observes: "La Phrygie était à peu près chrétienne que la Gaule ne comptait encore qu'un très petit nombre d'églises organisées." Cp. Ramsay, as cited above (p. 245).

Otrus (inscriptions).

Hieropolis (inscriptions).

Pepuza (Eus., v. 18; a dated inscription of 260 A.D.; cp. Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. 36, No. 156).

Tymion (Eus., v. 18).

[Ardabau] (birthplace of Montanus; Eus., v. 16).

Apamea (Eus., v. 16; Nicæa).

Cumane, a village (Eus., v. 16).

Eumenea (Eus., v. 16, v. 24; two dated inscriptions from 249 or 250 A.D.; cp. Cumont, p. 36, Nos. 135, 136).

Sanaus [= Valentia] (Nicæa).

Synnada (Eus., vi. 19, vii. 7; Nicæa).

Trajanopolis (a dated inscription of 279 A.D.; cp. Cumont, p. 37, No. 172). This town is the same as Grimenotyræ; cp. Ramsay's *Phrygia*, p. 558.

Azani (Nicæa).

Dorylæum (Nicæa).

Eucarpia (Nicæa).

Cotiæium (a local Novatian bishop; Socrat. iv. 28).

Lampe and the Siblianoi district (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay's *Phrygia*, pp. 222 f., 539 f.).

The Hyrgalic district, together with Lunda and Motella (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, pp. 540 f.).

Sebaste or Dioskome (two dated inscriptions of 253 or 256 A.D.; cp. Ramsay, pp. 560 f., and Cumont, p. 36, Nos. 160, 161).

[Stektorion] (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, pp. 719 f.).

Bruzos (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, pp. 700 f.).

The Moxiane district (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, pp. 717 f.).

Prymnessus (martyrdom of Ariadne; cp. Franchi de Cavalieri, *Acta Theodoti*, etc.).

[Themisonium] (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, p. 556).

Acmonia or Keramon Agora (inscriptions; cp. Ramsay, pp. 562 f., 621 f., 674).

Tiberiopolis (martyr).

Amorion (martyr).[1]

Pisidia and Lycaonia[2]:—

Iconium (the metropolis—Paul, *Acta Theclae*, *Acta Justini*, Hierax of Iconium, born of Christian parents, Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19, vii. 7, vii. 28, Nikomas the bishop of Iconium, council of Nicæa).

Antioch (Paul).

Lystra (Paul).

Derbe (Paul).

Philomelium (ep. Smyrniote church to the local church, *circa* 156 A.D.).

Hadrianopolis (Nicæa).

Neapolis (Nicæa).

Seleucia (Nicæa).

Limenæ (Nicæa).

Amblada (Nicæa).

[1] In the *Acta Achatii* (Ruinart, *Acta Mart.*, Ratisbon, 1859, pp. 199 f.), which are said to belong to the reign of Decius, a distinction is drawn (in the fourth chapter) between "Cataphryges, homines religionis antiquae" and "Christiani catholicae legis," so that the Antioch mentioned in the first chapter, whose bishop was Achatius, is Pisidian Antioch. Or was Achatius chor-episcopus in the vicinity of the city? He is called "a shield and succour for the district of Antioch" ("Scutum quoddam ac refugium Antiochae regionis"). Towards the close of the *Acta* a certain "Piso Traianorum (Trojanorum?) episcopus" is mentioned. Is not this town the Phrygian Trajanopolis, which lies not very far from Pisidian Antioch? We can hardly think of a bishop of Troas in Mysia Minor, who indeed would be termed "episcopus Trojanus."

[2] The bishoprics, with the exception of Iconium, all lie in the western division of the province. The large eastern division does not appear to have been Christianized.

Metropolis (Nicæa).

Apamea (Nicæa; also an earlier dated inscription of 254 A.D.; cp. Cumont, p. 38, No. 209).

Pappa (Nicæa).

Baris (Nicæa).

Vasada (Nicæa).

[Calytis = Canytis? in Pisidia] (martyrs).

As with Bithynia, so with Pisidia—as the number of bishops at Nicæa proves, the province (*i.e.* its western division) was widely Christianized. But as it produced no prominent bishops or writers, we learn nothing of its local church-history, apart from Iconium.

E. Asia (Lydia, Mysia) and Caria.

Thanks to Paul and the unknown John, Asia became the leading Christian province throughout Asia Minor. As has been already noted, the churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Sardes, Philadelphia, Thyatira, Troas, Magnesia on the Mæander, Tralles, and possibly Parium, were all founded in the primitive age. Speaking from the experience of his travels and all he had seen in Asia, Ignatius mentions [p. 244] ἐπίσκοποι κατὰ τὰ πέρατα [sc. τοῦ κόσμου] ὁρισθέντες — so widespread and numerous did the Asiatic bishops seem to him (*ad Ephes.* 3). Papylus (*Mart. Carpi*, ch. 32; see above, p. 151) tells the magistrate at Pergamum, ἐν πάσῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ καὶ πόλει εἰσίν μοι τέκνα κατὰ θεόν, referring primarily to Asia. Irenæus (iii. 3. 4) speaks of "all the churches in Asia," and the epistle of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, to Victor of Rome during the Easter controversy (cp. Eus., *H.E.*, v. 24) brings out

very plainly the dignity and the self-consciousness of the church at Ephesus. Ephesus was the custodian of the great cherished memories of the churches of Asia-Phrygia, memories which secured to these churches a descent and origin at least equal to that of the church of Rome. "For in Asia, too, great luminaries have sunk to rest which shall rise again on the day of the Lord's coming; namely, Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who rests in Hierapolis, with his two daughters, who grew old as virgins, and his other daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and lies buried at Ephesus. Then, too, there is John, who reclined on the Lord's breast, and who was a priest wearing the sacerdotal plate, a martyr, and a teacher. He also rests at Ephesus. And Polycarp, too, in Smyrna, both bishop and martyr; and Thraseas, also a bishop and martyr, from Eumenea, who rests at Smyrna. Why need I further mention the bishop and martyr Sagaris, who rests at Laodicea, or the blessed Papirius, or Melito the eunuch, whose whole life was lived in the Holy Spirit, and who lies at Sardes?" Note also how Polycrates proceeds to add: "I, too, Polycrates, hold by the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have closely followed; for *seven of my relatives were bishops*, and I am the eighth." We do not know where these seven bishoprics are to be looked for in Asia, and unfortunately we are just as ignorant of the members of that largely attended Asiatic synod, convoked during the Easter controversy, of which Polycrates writes thus: "I could name the bishops present, whom I had summoned at your desire [*i.e.* of Victor, the bishop of Rome]; were I

to go over their names, they would amount to an extremely large number."

Important sources relative to the churches in Smyrna are available for us in the epistles of John, Ignatius, and Polycarp, as well as in the epistle of the church to Philomelium and in the Martyrdom of Pionius (in the reign of Decius); see also the accounts of Noetus, the modalistic Christian, at Smyrna. One outstanding feature is the local struggle between the Jews and the Christians, and also the high repute of Polycarp ("the father of the Christians," as the pagans called him; *ep. Smyrn.* xii.). During Polycarp's lifetime, there were several Christian churches near Smyrna, for Irenæus tells Florinus that Polycarp addressed letters to them (Eus., v. 24). There was also a Marcionite church at Smyrna or in the neighbourhood during the days of Pionius, for the latter had a Marcionite presbyter called Metrodorus as his fellow-martyr.[1] But unluckily none of all these sources furnishes us with any idea of the Symrniote church's size.[2] In the *Apost. Constit.* vii. 46 there is a list of the first bishops of Smyrna.

Pergamum, where the first Asiatic martyr perished, is familiar to us in early church history from the martyrdom of Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonikê (apart from the Johannine letter to the church); Sardes is known to us through Melito, the local

[1] The sharp emphasis laid on "the Catholic church" in the Martyrdom of Pionius indicates plainly that there were sectarian, and especially Montanist, churches in Smyrna and Asia.

[2] In the *Mart. Pionii* a village called Karina is mentioned as having a Christian presbyter.

bishop, *c.* 170 A.D., whose large ideas upon the relation of the church to the empire would not have been possible had not Christianity been already a power to reckon with in Sardes and in Asia. The authority used by Epiphanius in *Hær.* li. 33 declares that almost the whole of Thyatira was won for Christ by the opening of the third century; he also mentions churches which had arisen in the neighbourhood of Thyatira, but without giving any names. Papylus, who suffered martyrdom in Pergamum, was an itinerant preacher hailing from Thyatira.

The wide diffusion of the Asiatic churches, and the zeal they displayed in the interests of the church at large, come out in a passage from Lucian's tale of *Proteus Peregrinus*, where, after narrating Proteus' conversion and imprisonment in Syria, he goes on to say: "In fact, people actually came from several Asiatic towns, dispatched by the local Christians, in order to render aid, to conduct the defence, and to encourage the man. They become incredibly alert when anything of this kind occurs that affects their common interests. On such occasions no expense is grudged."

The subscriptions of the Nicene council furnish further evidence of Asiatic (Lydian and Mysian) and Carian towns with local churches; viz., Cyzikus (where there was also a Novatian church; Socrat., ii. 38), Ilium, another (?) Ilium, Hypæpa, Anæa, Bagis, Tripolis, Ancyra ferrea, Aurelianopolis, Standus [Silandus? Blaundus?], and Hierocæsarea.[1] In Caria: Antioch, Aphrodisias (martyr., and Christian

[1] The bishops of Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardes, Thyatira, and Philadelphia were also present at Nicæa.

inscriptions, to boot), Apollonias, Cibyra (inscriptions; cp. also Epiph., *Hær.*, li. 30), and Miletus. Martyr-Acts from the reign of Decius (Ruinart, p. 205) also prove the existence of a Christian church at Lampsacus.

Perhaps on account of the Easter controversy, the importance of Ephesus and the Asiatic churches, relatively to the church at large[1] steadily declined from the close of the second century in favour of the church of Rome. This did not mean any falling off, however, in its numbers, rather the contrary.

F. Lycia, Pamphylia, and Isauria.

No fewer than twenty-five bishops from these three southern provinces of Asia Minor were present at Nicæa (including four chor-episcopi from Isauria)—a sad contrast to the little we know of the churches in these districts. With regard to Lycia (Olympus and Patara), we are acquainted with the personality of Methodius, that influential teacher of the church who lived *c.* 300 A.D. The newly-discovered inscription of Arycanda (Maximinus Daza) also informs us that there were Christians in that locality, and that the town joined in presenting servile petitions against them.[2] And finally, it is rendered probable, by the *Acta Pauli*, that there were Christians in Myra, while similar evidence is perhaps afforded by Eusebius

[1] It was probably the place where the canon of the four gospels originated.

[2] *Archæol.-epigraph. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich-Ungarn.*, ed. von Benndorf u. Bormann (1893), pp. 93 f., 108.

(*Mart. Pal.* iv.-v.) with regard to Gagæ, not far from Olympus.[1] Nothing is heard of the churches in Pamphylia, however, from the mention of Pergê in Acts down to the council of Nicæa, apart from one martyrdom in Attalia; while all we know of Isauria is the notice in Eusebius (vi. 19) which has been already brought forward (cp. p. 358). The following is a list of the churches throughout the three provinces, known to us for the most part from the council of Nicæa:—

Lycia: Patara (Method., Martyr., Nic.), Olympus (Method.), Arycanda (inscr. from reign of Daza), [Gagæ] (Euseb.), Myra (*Acta Pauli*), Perdikia? (Nic., but doubtful).

Pamphylia: Pergê (Acts, Nic.), Termissus, Syarba, Aspendus, Seleucia, Maximianopolis, Magydus (all six from Nic., though Magydus is also supported by the tradition of St Conon's martyrdom under Decius; cp. von Gebhardt's *Acta Mart. Sel.*, pp. 129 f.), Sidê (since this town is mentioned shortly afterwards as the metropolis of Pamphylia, it probably had a church *circa* 325 A.D.),[2] Attalia (Mart.).

Isauria: Laranda (Alex. of Jerus., in Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 19, Nic.), Barata, Koropissus, Claudiopolis, Seleucia, Metropolis, Panemon Teichos, Antioch, Syedra, Humanades (= Umanada), Huasades, Alistra, Dio-Cæsarea? (or some other township of Isauria).

[1] "Gagæ" (not Pagæ) is to be read; cp. Mercati's *I Martiri di Palestina del Codice Sinaitico* (Estratto dai "Rendiconti" del R. Inst. Lomb., Serie ii., vol. xxx. 1897).

[2] Sidê was also the birthplace of Eustathius, afterwards bishop of Sebaste. As Athanasius calls him a confessor, he must have attested his Christianity in Sidê during the Diocletian persecution.

§ 10. Crete and the Islands (especially the Ionian).

From the epistle to Titus it follows that Christianity had reached Crete before the close of the apostolic age. About 170 A.D. Dionysius of Corinth wrote an epistle "to the church of Gorthyna and to the other churches of Crete" (Gorthyna being evidently the metropolis), and a second epistle to the Cretan church of Cnossus, whose bishop, Pinytus by name, wrote him a reply (Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23). But nothing further is known of early Christianity in the island, and no bishop came from Crete to the Nicene council.

Achelis (*Zeitschr. für die neutest. Wissensch.*, i. pp. 87 f.), like some other scholars before him, has tried to prove, from the evidence of the inscriptions, that Christian churches existed on the smaller islands, particularly in Rhodes and Thera and Therasia, as early as *circa* 100 A.D.; but the proofs of this are unsatisfactory, both as regards the fact of Christianity and the age of the inscriptions. Thus, even in the third century, one may put a query opposite Thera and Therasia in connection with Christianity. But in Melos, again, Christians seem certainly to have existed in the third century. Patmos, with its great associations, they would hardly leave unclaimed till the fourth century; and martyrdoms are connected in tradition with Chios. Bishops from Rhodes (where early inscriptions have been also discovered), Cos, Lemnos, and Corcyra, attended the Nicene council.

Paul is reported (*Const. App.*, vii. 46) to have

installed Crispus as the first bishop of Ægina—a legend which denotes the existence of a church there at some early period. The presence of gnostic Christians at Samê in Cephallenia may be inferred from Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, iii. 2. 5.[1]

§ 11. Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Epirus, Thessaly, Greece.[2]

We have but a faint knowledge of Christianity in the Balkan peninsula during the first centuries. No outstanding figures emerge, and Dionysius of Corinth, who exhorted and counselled many churches East and West by his letters during the reign of M. Aurelius, and collected these letters into a volume (Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23), stands quite by himself. The extension of Christianity was far from being uniform. In "Europe," over against Bithynia, and Thrace, there must have been numerous churches previous to 325 (cp. also *Vit. Const.*, iv. 43), as is evident from the

[1] Epiphanius the gnostic, whose father was Carpocrates, was connected with Cephallenia through his mother, καὶ θεὸς ἐν Σάμῃ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας τετίμηται, ἔνθα αὐτῷ ἱερὸν ῥυτῶν λίθων, βωμοί, τεμένη, μουσεῖον ᾠκοδόμηταί τε καὶ καθιέρωται, καὶ συνιόντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οἱ Κεφαλλῆνες κατὰ νουμηνίαν γενέθλιον ἀποθέωσιν θύουσιν Ἐπιφάνει, σπένδουσί τε καὶ εὐωχοῦνται καὶ ὕμνοι λέγονται ("And is honoured as a god in Same of Cephallenia, where a shrine of huge stones, with altars and precincts and a museum, has been erected for him, and consecrated. And the Cephallenians celebrate his birthday at new moon, assembling at his shrine, doing sacrifice, pouring forth libations, and feasting, with song of hymns to him").

[2] These represent different provinces of the church with metropolitans of their own (cp. Optatus, ii. 1: "Ecclesia in tribus Pannoniis, in Dacia, Mœsia, Thracia, Achaia, Macedonia"). I group them together merely for the sake of unity, as we know little of their

church-history of Thrace during the fourth century. Corinth and Thessalonica had flourishing churches. But the larger part of the peninsula cannot have had more than a scanty population of Christians up till 325, so that we cannot speak of any common Christian character or type, of course, in this connection. I shall therefore proceed to set down a list of the various places, not according to their provinces, but as far as possible in chronological order. First, those which are known to us from the earliest period.

Philippi, *πρώτη [πρώτης] μερίδος τ. Μακεδονίας πόλις* (Acts xvi. 12; Paul, Polycarp's epistle; pseudo-Dionysius is our only witness to another letter of his addressed to Athens [1]).

Thessalonica (where there was a synagogue, or else *the* synagogue of the province; Paul; Antoninus Pius wrote to this city, forbidding any rising against the Christians [Melito, in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 26]; the metropolitan was present at Nicæa, and also at the dedication of the church of Jerusalem, *Vit. Const.*, iv. 43).

Berœa (Paul).

respective histories. Duchesne's study, *Les anciens évêchés de la Grèce* (1896), and the earlier works of de Boor (*Zeits. f. k. Gesch.*, xii. 1891, pp. 520 f.), and Gelzer (*Zeits. f. Wiss. Theol.*, xxxii. 1892, pp. 419 f.), refer to a later period, but even the period previous to 300 may have some light cast on it by the list (Duchesne, p. 14), which assigns to Eubœa three bishoprics (Chalcis, Carystus, Porthmus), to Attica one (Athens), to Northern Greece ten (Megara, Thebes, Tanagra, Platæa, Thespiæ, Coronia, Opus, Elatæa, Scarphia, Naupactus), to the Peloponnese seven (Corinth, Argos, Lacedæmon, Messina, Megalopolis, Tegæa, Patras).

[1] For "Macedonia," see J. Weiss's article in the *Prot. R.-Encyklop.*[3], vol. xii.

Athens[1] (Paul). From the outset the church here was small, and small it remained, for in this city of philosophers Christianity could find little room. According to Dionysius of Corinth, Dionysius the Areopagite was the first bishop of Athens; Antoninus Pius forbade the city to rise against the Christians (see above); and after the persecution of M. Aurelius, Dionysius of Corinth wrote to the church (Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23), "accusing them almost of apostasy from the faith since the death of their martyred bishop Publius; and mentioning Quadratus who succeeded Publius in the episcopate, testifying that the church had been gathered together again by his zealous efforts and had gained new ardour for the faith." Origen, who spent some time in Athens, and indeed visited it on two occasions at least (Eus., vi. 32), mentions the local church in *c. Cels.*, III. xxx.: "The church of God at Athens is a peaceable and orderly body, as it desires to please Almighty God. Whereas the assembly of the Athenians is refractory, nor can it be compared in any respect to the local church or assembly of God." The bishop of Athens attended Nicæa.

Corinth (Paul; the epistle of the Roman church to the church of Corinth *c.* 95 A.D.; Hegesippus, in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 22, ἐπέμενεν ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ Κορινθίων ἐν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ μέχρι Πρίμου ἐπισκοπεύοντος ἐν Κορίνθῳ· οἷς συνέμιξα πλέων εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ συνδιέτριψα τοῖς Κορινθίοις ἡμέρας ἱκανάς, ἐν αἷς συνανεπάημεν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ = "the Corinthian church remained by the true faith till Primus was bishop

[1] See the instructive article on "Greece in the Apostolic Age," by J. Weiss, *ibid.*, vol. vii. Apart from Corinth, Greece was a reduced country by the time it came into contact with Christianity.

in Corinth. I conversed with them on my way to Rome, and spent some time with the Corinthians, during which we refreshed each other with orthodox teaching." Dionysius of Corinth[1]).

Cenchreæ (Paul; the *Apost. Constit.* [vii. 46] mentions the first bishop, whom Paul is said to have appointed).

Lacedæmon (Dionysius of Corinth wrote a letter to this church [Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23], enjoining peace and unity; the fact of a Christian community existing in a country town like Lacedæmon by the year 170, proves that missionary work had been done from Corinth throughout the Peloponnese, although the subsequent era shows that Christianity only got a footing there with difficulty).

Larissa in Thessaly (Melito [in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 20] tells us that Antoninus Pius wrote to this town, forbidding it to rise against the Christians),[2] the metropolis; its bishop was at Nicæa, for, as I take it, the "Claudian of Thessaly," as he is called in most of the lists, is the bishop of Larissa. The Greek recension actually describes him as such.

[1] The second recension, extant only in Syriac, of the pseudo-Justin's "Address to the Greeks" (cp. *Sitzungsber. der K. Preuss. Akad. d. W.*, 1896, pp. 627 f.), hails from Corinth perhaps, or at any rate from Greece. It is a third century document, and opens with these words: "Memoirs which have been written by Ambrose, a senator of Greece, who became a Christian. All his fellow-senators cried out against him, so he fled away and wrote in order to show them all their mad frenzy." In any case the reference is to the conversion of a councillor in a Greek city.

[2] This edict, addressed by Pius to Thessalonica, Athens, Larissa, and "the Greeks," shows that the strength of Christianity in these cities must not be underrated. Certainly, one has to bear in mind the intolerance of Greeks in all matters of religion.

Debeltum in Thrace (Eus. v. 19 informs us that this town had a bishop towards the close of the second century).

Anchialus in Thrace (which also had a bishop about the same time; *loc. cit.*).

Nicopolis in Epirus (according to Eus., *H.E.*, vi. 16, Origen was there; so that there must have been local Christians at that time [Paul wished to winter there, according to the epistle to Titus]).

Byzantium in Europe (where the Christologist Theodotus was born about 190 A.D. [Hippol., *Philos.*, vii. 35; perhaps one may refer also to Tert., *ad Scap.* iii.]; on Alexander, the local bishop when Arius appeared, cp. Alex. of Alex. in Theodoret, *H.E.*, i. 2).

Heraclea in Europe, the metropolis (Nicæa).

Stobi in Macedonia (Nicæa).

Thebes in Thessaly (Nicæa).

Eubœa, (Nicæa).

Pele in Thessaly (Nicæa; doubtful, however).

Scupi [= Üsküb] in Dardania (Nicæa. The entry runs as follows: Δαρδανίας· Δάκος Μακεδονίας, alluding, I should say, to this bishopric).

Trustworthy notices of the martyrs permit us finally to assume the existence of Christians in Adrianopolis (Ruinart, p. 439), Drizipara = Drusipara, and Epibata in Thrace, Buthrotus in Epirus, and Pydna.[1]

[1] At Tricca in Thessaly, a certain Heliodorus was bishop (according to Socrates, *H.E.*, v. 22). If he is to be identified, as Socrates declares he is, with the author of the romance, he must have lived at the close of the third century, for the romance dates from the reign of Aurelian, and was a youthful work. Rohde, however, doubts this identification.

Thracian Christianity was that of Bithynia. No Macedonian or Greek Christianity ever arose, like the Christianity of Asia Minor, or of Syria, or of Egypt, vigorous as the missionary efforts of the Thessalonian church may have been.—For the local martyrs, see especially the Martyrol. Syriacum.

§ 12. Mœsia and Pannonia, Noricum and Dalmatia.[1]

On the soil of Mœsia (and of Pannonia, in part), while the Romans and the Greeks competed for the task of ruling and of developing the land, the former gradually got the upper hand, and the province must have been counted as Western in the main at an early period. Here, too, we find from Acts of martyrs and the church's history in the fourth century, that Christianity secured a firm footing in the third century. Even by the time that Eusebius wrote, however, the local churches (like those of Pannonia) were still young. At the dedication of the church at Jerusalem, he writes (*Vita Constant.*, iv. 43), the Mœsians and Pannonians were represented by "the fairest bloom of God's *youthful stock* among them" (τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀνθοῦντα κάλλη τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ νεολαίας). All that we learn from the Nicene subscriptions is that in "Dacia" (the country south of the Danube, modern Servia) at Sardica there was one bishopric, with another at Marcianopolis in Mœsia (near the shores of the Black Sea), but the Acts of the martyrs testify to the presence of Christians at Dorostorium

[1] See the studies in *Anal. Bolland.*, 1879, pp. 369 f., "Saints d'Istric et de Dalmatie."

(Ruinart, p. 570, and *Mart. Dasii*), Tomi (*Mart.*), and Axiupolis (*Mart.*), previous to the council of Nicæa.

One Pannonian bishop was present at Nicæa (bishopric unknown). The Acts of the martyrs tell us of Christian communities at Sirmium (Ruinart, p. 432), Cibalis (*ibid.*, p. 434), Siscia (*ibid.*, p. 521; cp. Jerome's *Chron.*, ad ann. 2324), Singidunum (*ibid.*, p. 435),[1] Noviodunum (*Mart. Syr.*), Scarabantia (*ibid.*, p. 523), and Sabaria, the birthplace of Martin of Tours, whose parents, however, were pagans (*ibid.*, p. 523). The diocese of the notorious bishop Valens at Mursa would also be ante-Nicene. Even the distant Pettau had a bishop *c.* 300 A.D., and in Victorinus it had one who was famous as a theologian and author, well versed in Greek Christian literature.

It is extremely surprising how few bishops from Mœsia or Pannonia (even from the provinces mentioned under § 11) were present at Nicæa. Was the emperor indifferent to their presence? Had they themselves no interest in the questions to be discussed at the council? We cannot tell. Nevertheless, the fourth century saw a large proportion of the spiritual interchange in the church between East and West realized in one province, and that province was Mœsia.

The likelihood is that the number of bishops (and consequently of churches also) was still small (see above).—It is intrinsically probable that Christianity also penetrated Noricum, a country studded with towns and wholly Romanized by 300 A.D., with Pettau, too, lying close upon its boundary. But the sole direct evidence we possess is a notice of the martyr-

[1] Ursacius was afterwards the bishop of this place.

dom of St Florian in Lorsch (*Martyrol. Jer.*: "in Norico ripense loco Lauriaco," cp. Achelis, *op. cit.*, p. 140). A saint called Maximilian was also honoured in Salzburg (Hauck's *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, i. p. 347), and Athanasius mentions bishops of Noricum about the year 343 (*Apol. c. Arian* i.). But apart from Lorsch, no church in Noricum and no bishopric can be certainly referred to the pre-Constantine period.

The wealth of inscriptions which have been discovered bring to light a considerable amount of Christianity in Dalmatia, which may be held with great probability to go back to the pre-Christian period, particularly as regards Salona (martyrdoms also; cp. now *CIL.*, vol. iii., Supplem., Pars Poster.), where a local churchyard goes back as far as the very beginning of the second century (Jelic, in the *Röm. Quartalschrift*, vol. v. 1891; cp. *Bull. Dalmat.*, vol. xv. 1892, pp. 159 f.). Four Christian stone-masons worked in the mines of Fruschka Gora, whither Cyril, bishop of Antioch, was also banished (cp. *Passio quattuor coronat.*, in *Sitzungsberichte der K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch.*, 1896, pp. 1288 f.).[1]

§ 13. The North and North-west Coasts of the Black Sea.

Theophilus, bishop of "Gothia," and Cadmus, bishop of Bosporus, attended the Nicene council. Both bishoprics are indeed to be looked for on the Balkan peninsula, but it is possible that "Gothia"

[1] See Delehaye in *Annal. Boll.* (1904) on "l'hagiographie de Salone d'après les dernières découvertes archéol."

was the bishopric of Tomi. It does not follow that because there were Christians in those cities, there were Christian Goths by that time, for the cities were Greek. But it is indubitable that the conversion of this German tribe had commenced before the year 325. On a military raid through Asia Minor in 258, the Goths had captured and taken home with them a number of Cappadocian Christians, who maintained their Christian standing, continued to keep up some connection with Cappadocia, and did mission-work among the Goths themselves (*Philostorg.*, ii. 5). It was Ulfilas, of course, who initiated the work of converting the Goths upon a large scale, but shortly before his day mission-work in the interior of Gotha (εἰς τὰ ἐσώτατα τῆς Γοτθίας) was undertaken by the Mesopotamian monk Arnobius, who had been banished to Scythia (cp. Epiph., *Hær.*, lxx. 14). Still, Sozomen (viii. 19) notes, as a striking fact, that the Scythians had only one bishop, although their country included a number of towns (in which, of course, there were Christians). Tradition tells us of some martyrdoms, which are not quite certain, at the Tauric town of Cherson during the reign of Diocletian. So far as I know, the inscriptions discovered in Southern Russia have not disclosed any Christian element which can be referred with certainty to the first three centuries.

§ 14. Rome, Middle and Lower Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia.

For these and all subsequent regions in our discussion, the Nicene list ceases to be of any service; all it furnishes is the bare fact that deputies from the

bishop of Rome, bishop Hosius of Cordova (as the commissioner of Constantine), Bishop Marcus of Calabria (from Brindisi?), bishop Cæcilian of Carthage, and bishop Nicasius of Duja in Gaul (= Diê), were present at the council. In place of it we get the episcopal lists of the synods of Carthage (under Cyprian), Elvira, Rome (313 A.D.), and Arles (314). The beginnings of Christianity in the Western towns (including Rome) and in the provinces are obscure throughout. *A priori*, we should conjecture that Rome took some part in the Christianizing of these regions, but beyond this conjecture we cannot go. The later legends which vouch for systematic missionary enterprise on the part of the Roman bishops are unauthentic one and all. Some basis for them may have been found in the former passage in the epistle of Pope Innocent I. to bishop Decentius (*ep.* XXV. 2): "It is certain that throughout all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Sicily, and the intervening islands, no one has founded any church except those appointed to the priesthood by the apostle Peter or his successors." But this passage itself is a product of tendency, and destitute of historical foundation.

In Rome and throughout Italy Christianity at first spread among the Greek population[1] and retained

[1] One recollects Seneca's remarks upon the population of Rome: "Jube istos omnes ad nomen citari et unde domo quisque sit quaere; videbis maiorem partem esse quae relictis sedibus suis venerit in maximam quidem et pulcherrimam urbem, non tamen suam" ("Have them all summoned by name, and ask each his birthplace. You will find the majority have left their homes and come to the greatest and fairest of cities—yet a city which is not their own"), *adv. Helv.* 6.

Greek as its language. Even Hippolytus, who belonged to the Roman church and died *c.* 235 A.D., wrote nothing but Greek; and the first author to employ the Latin tongue, so far as I know, is the Roman bishop Victor (189–199). The episcopal list of the Roman church down to Victor contains only a couple of Latin names. When Polycarp of Smyrna reached Rome in 154, he conducted public worship there (*i.e.* in Greek), and it was in Greek that the old Roman symbol was composed (about the middle of the second century, or, as some hold, later). The Roman clergy did not become predominantly Latin till the episcopate of Fabian (shortly before the middle of the third century), and then it was that the church acquired her first Latin writer of importance in the indefatigable presbyter Novatian. Long ere this, of course, there had been a considerable Latin element in the church. Since the middle of the second century, there must have been worship in Latin at Rome as well as in Greek,[1] necessitating ere long translation of the scriptures. But the origins of the Latin versions are wrapt in mystery. They may have commenced in Northern Africa earlier than in Rome itself.

The church of Rome was founded by some unknown missionaries at the beginning of the apostolic age. It was already of considerable importance when Paul wrote to it from Corinth, comprising several

[1] According to the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the church still seems entirely Greek; at least the author never mentions bilingual worship, though he had the chance of doing so. Still, the Latin versions of his own book, of Clemens Romanus, and of the baptismal symbol, fall within the second century.

small churches (ecclesiolæ, Rom. xvi.); and "its faith was spoken of throughout all the world" (i. 8). By the time Paul himself reached Rome, there was even a small church "in Cæsar's household" (ἐν Καίσαρος οἰκίᾳ, Phil. iv. 22). Not long afterwards, when the Neronic persecution broke upon the church, an "ingens multitudo Christianorum" (Tacitus) or πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν (Clem. Rom. vi.) were resident in Rome. Allowing for the fact that the "crowd" is reckoned one way in the case of judicial murders and another way in that of popular assemblies, we may still find both of these calculations sufficiently weighty. The members of the church of Rome must at that time have been already counted by the hundreds.

Paul and Peter both fell in this persecution. But the church soon recovered itself. We meet it in the epistle of Clement (about 95 A.D.), consolidated, active, and conscious of its obligation to care for all the church. The discipline of "our troops" presents itself to this church and the other churches as a pattern of conduct, uniting them together in the ranks and bond of Christian love. The "rule of tradition" is to be maintained by the church. Order, discipline, and obedience are to prevail, not fanaticism and wilfulness; every element of excited fervour seems to be tabooed. The Christian church of Rome had in fact adopted even by this time the characteristics of the city, Greek though it was in nature; it felt itself to be the church of the world's capital. And already it numbered among its members some of the emperor's most intimate circle.

This consciousness on the part of the Roman church, which was justified by the duties which it

discharged, was recognized by other churches. Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, extols it about 115 A.D. in extravagant language as being the "leading church in the region of the Romans" (*προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων*) and "the leader of love" (*προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης* (*ad Rom.*, inscript.), whilst Dionysius of Corinth writes to her, about 170 A.D. (Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 13), in terms that have been already quoted (cp. vol. i. pp. 222, 230).

These passages imply that the church had ample means at her disposal,[1] and this, again, suggests a large number of members, including many rich people—an inference corroborated by the "Shepherd" of Hermas, a Roman document which lets us see deep into the state of the church in Hadrian's reign, revealing a very large number of Christians at Rome, and betraying the presence among them of a considerable number of well-to-do and wealthy members, with whom the author is naturally wroth. The epistle of Ignatius also proves how the church had pushed its way into the most influential circles of the population. Why, the good bishop is actually afraid of being deprived of his martyrdom through the misguided intervention of the Roman Christians! It goes without saying that, under such circumstances, the needs of the Christian community at Rome could not be met by a single place of assembly. But Justin says so explicitly. When asked by the judge, "Where do you meet?" he replies, "Where everyone chooses and wherever we can" [which is evasive]. "Think you

[1] We know, moreover, that Marcion brought her a present of 200,000 sesterces when he joined her membership (cp. above, vol. i. p. 194).

we can all meet in one place? Not so" (*ἔνθα ἑκάστῳ προαίρεσις καὶ δύναμίς ἐστι. πάντως γὰρ νομίζεις ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέρχεσθαι ἡμᾶς πάντας; οὐχ οὕτως δέ*). Still more valuable is the testimony borne soon after 166 A.D. by the Roman bishop Soter, the author of the so-called second epistle of Clement. He observes, in connection with the saying of a prophet[1] (c. ii.), that Christians were already superior in numbers to the Jews; and although the statement is general, one must assume that, as it was written in Rome, it applied to Rome, and especially to middle and lower Italy.

Thanks to the large number of Christians from all provinces and sects who continued to flock to Rome,[2] not merely did local Christianity go on increasing, but the church would have had the duty of caring for the interests of the church at large thrust on her, even had she not spontaneously borne it in mind. Besides, her position in the city grew stronger day by day. And in this connection the age of Commodus marked an epoch by itself. Eusebius relates (v. 21) how "our affairs then became more favourable, while the saving word led an uncommonly large number of souls of every race to the devout worship of God. In fact, a number of those who were eminent at Rome for their wealth and birth, began to adopt the way of salvation, with their whole households and families." It is well known,

[1] He is explaining Isa. liv. 1, partly of the Jews, partly of the Christians; and in this connection he observes, *ἔρημος ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν, νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύσαντες πλείονες ἐγενόμεθα τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν θεόν* (see above, p. 151).

[2] An almost complete survey is given by Caspari in his *Quellen z. Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, vol. iii. (1875).

e.g., how much influence the Christians had with Marcia, the "devout concubine" (φιλόθεος παλλακή) of the emperor.[1] The advance made by Christianity among the upper classes, and especially among women, in Rome, resulted in the edict of bishop Callistus,[2] which gave an ecclesiastical imprimatur to sexual unions between Christian ladies and their slaves. Furthermore, the importance attaching to Christianity in Rome is proved by a number of passages from Tertullian,[3] from the attitude of the Roman bishops after Victor, and from the large number of sects which had churches in Rome at the beginning of the third century. Besides the Catholic churches, we know of a Montanist, a Theodotian (or Adoptian), a Modalist, a Marcionite, and several gnostic churches besides the church of Hippolytus.

After the reign of Commodus and the episcopate of Victor, the reign of Philip the Arabian and the episcopate of Fabian (236–250) form the next stage in the story (cp. *Protest. R.-Encyklop.*[3], v. pp. 721 f.). Two structural features mark the growing size of the church at Rome. One is the creation of the lower clergy with their five orders, the other is the division of the Roman church into seven districts (or 7×2),

[1] Hippol., *Philos.*, ix. 12. The Roman bishop Victor went to and from her freely. One gathers from this passage also that the Roman church kept a list of all who languished in the mines of Sardinia.

[2] The statement of the papal catalogue about Callistus having built a church in Rome across the Tiber ("trans Tiberim") may be quite authentic.

[3] He writes, *e.g.*, of the emperor Septimius: "Sed et clarissimas feminas et clarissimos viros, sciens huius sectae esse, non modo non laesit verum et testimonio exornavit" (*ad Scap.* iv.: cp. above, p. 200).

corresponding to the various quarters of the city (Catal. Liber: "Fabianus regiones divisit diaconibus").[1] Two pieces of evidence throw light upon the extent and the importance of the church at this period (*c.* 250 A.D.); one is the saying of Decius that he would rather have a rival emperor in Rome than a bishop,[2] and the other is the statement of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in a letter (Eus., vi. 43) to the effect that "there were 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 sub-deacons, 42 acolytes, 52 exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers, and 1500 widows and persons in distress, all of whom the Master's grace and lovingkindness support" (*πρεσβυτέρους τεσσεράκοντα ἕξ, διακόνους ἑπτά, ὑποδιακόνους ἑπτά, ἀκολούθους δύο καὶ τεσσεράκοντα, ἐξορκιστὰς δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἅμα πυλωροῖς δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα, χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλίας πεντακοσίας, οὓς πάντας ἡ τοῦ δεσπότου χάρις καὶ φιλανθρωπία διατρέφει*).

So far as regards statistics, this passage is the most weighty which we possess for the church-history of the first three centuries. In 257 A.D. the Roman

[1] Cp. Duchesne's *Le Liber Pontif.*, i. p. 148; and Harnack in *Texte u. Unters.*, iv. 5. The entry in the papal list runs thus: "Hic regiones dividit diaconibus et fecit vii subdiacones."—*A propos* of Clement I., the papal list had noted: "Hic fecit vii regiones, dividit notariis fidelibus ecclesiae [sic], qui gestas martyrum sollicite et curiose unusquisque per regionem suam diligenter perquireret." The statement, of course, is valueless. See further under "Euarestus."

[2] So we learn from Cyprian, *ep.* lv. 9. With this antithesis we may compare a remark of Aurelian, preserved by Flavius Vopiscus (*Aurelian*, c. xx.): "Miror vos, patres sancti, tamdiu de aperiendis Sibyllinis dubitasse libris, proinde quasi in Christianorum ecclesia, non in templo deorum omnium tractaretis" ("I am astonished, holy father, that you have hesitated so long upon the question of opening the Sibylline books, just as if you were debating in the Christian assembly and not in the temple of all the gods").

church had evidently 155 clergy (with their bishop), who were maintained and fed, together with over 1500 widows and needy persons. From this I should put the number of Christians belonging to the Catholic church in Rome at not less than 30,000.[1] The forty-six priests perhaps denote as many places of worship in the city; for, as we see from Optatus (ii. 4), there were over forty basilicas in Rome about the year 300 ("quadraginta et quod excurrit basilicas"). This large number indicates the great size of the church.

Shortly after Fabian, Dionysius (259-268) apparently constituted the class of parish churches in Rome, and at the same time determined the episcopal dioceses under the metropolitan see of the capital, the former task being completed by Marcellus (308/309). Such is Duchesne's (*op. cit.*, i. 157) correct reading of the statements in the papal list: "Hic presbiteris ecclesias

[1] Probably this estimate is too low. At Antioch, as Chrysostom narrates (*opp.*, vii. p. 658, 810), the 3000 persons in receipt of relief were members of one church consisting of over 100,000 souls. In the case of Rome, then, we might put the total at about 50,000, which is the estimate of Gibbon, followed by Friedländer. One may conjecture, however, that the readiness of Christians to make sacrifices was greater about 250 in Rome than it was about 380 in Antioch, so that I shall exercise caution and calculate only 30,000, which would amount—if one takes very roughly the population of Rome at 900,000—to about a thirtieth of the population. Friedländer's (*Sittengesch.*, iii. p. 531) calculations bring out a twentieth (50,000 to a million). He may perhaps be right; at any rate the total about 250 A.D. lies somewhere between a twentieth and a thirtieth (from 5 to 3 per cent.). But between 250 and 312 an extraordinary increase of Christianity certainly occurred everywhere, and at Rome as well, which I doubt not is to be reckoned at least as equivalent to a doubling of the previous total (from 10 to 7 per cent.).

dedit et cymiteria et parrocias diocesis constituit," and (p. 164) "hic fecit cymiterium Novellae via Salaria et xxv titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi diocesis, propter baptismum et paenitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis et propter sepulturas martyrum." The parish churches of the city,[1] to the number of twenty-five, are the churches inside the city with their respective districts. The graveyards are the churchyards connected with the churches round about Rome (there being no rural parishes in the Roman church, and chor-episcopi being unknown in Italy). The "parochiae diocesis" are the episcopal churches under the control of the metropolis; but unfortunately we know neither their number nor their names.

The depth to which Christianity had struck its roots, even in the soil of culture, and the seriousness with which its doctrines rivalled those of the philosophers, may be seen from the discussions upon the dogmas of the various Christian parties in which Plotinus found it necessary to engage (cp. Carl Schmidt's "Plotinus and his attitude to Gnosticism and the Christianity of the Church," *Texte u. Unters.*, N.F. v. 4). The Syrian ladies of the royal house, Alexander Severus, Philip the Arabian, and the consort of Gallienus, had already directed their attention to Christianity, while (as we have seen above, p. 284), Aurelian used the church as one basis for his Eastern

[1] I have no call to go into further details in regard to these churches, as we are destitute of any information upon their further statistics. But their large number is itself significant. The papal catalogue—erroneously, of course—makes Pope Cletus create twenty-four parishes each under a presbyter at Rome; then again we read of Euarestus, "hic titulos in urbe Roma dividit presbiteris."

policy, and favoured that party in Antioch which held by the bishops of Rome and Italy. As for the brotherly feeling and wealth of the Roman Christians at this period, the best proof of these is to be found in their support of the churches in Syria and Arabia (cp. Dionysius in Eus., vii. 5).

During the subsequent period we find the usurper Maxentius assuming the mask of friendliness towards Christianity at the beginning of his reign, "*in order to cajole the people of Rome.*" If this statement is reliable (Eus., *H.E.*, viii. 14), it proves that Christians must have formed a very considerable percentage of the population. It is contradicted, however, by the fact that Maxentius ere long relied on Roman paganism, and persecuted the Christians. Furthermore, we gather from the measures taken by Constantine immediately after the rout of Maxentius, as well as from his donations, how much importance he attached to the Roman bishop; and lastly, the sixth canon of Nicæa informs us that the Roman bishop exercised unquestioned rights, as metropolitan or higher metropolitan, over a number even of the larger provinces. I consider it likely, though I cannot adduce the proof of it at this point, that the most of Middle as well as of Lower Italy (and Sicily ?) was subject to his higher metropolitan jurisdiction.[1]

[1] For the older controversies on this topic, see Hefele's *Concilien-Gesch.*[(2)], i. (Eng. trans., vol. i.). For the idea of the "urbica diocesis," see especially the essay of Mommsen on "The Italian Regions" in the *Kiepert-Festschrift* (1898), although it hardly covers the ecclesiastical conception. Let me explicitly observe that such terms as "metropolitan jurisdiction" or "higher metropolitan jurisdiction," cannot properly be used with reference to any of the Western provinces, for there was really no metropolitan class in the West

Such are perhaps the most weighty testimonies at our disposal in regard to the increase, the extent, and the importance of the Roman church.

As for the other Italian cities, we have to bewail the silence of our sources, although one statement is extant which casts a ray of light upon the situation. Eusebius (vi. 43) tells how Cornelius,[1] the Roman bishop, held a synod of sixty (Italian) bishops in 250/251 A.D. against Novatian. This he quotes from a writing of Cornelius himself, and proceeds to affirm (from the same source) that in one most remote district of Italy (*βραχύ τι μέρος καὶ ἐλάχιστον τῆς Ἰταλίας*, cp. vi. 43. 8) there were several bishops.[2] As not nearly all the bishops of a district ever attended any synod,[3] we can hardly go wrong if we suppose

before 325 A.D., as there was in the East. All that transpired was the accruing of certain powers to Rome (and Carthage) under the practical exigencies of the situation. We must think of these powers as in part less, in part greater, than those of the Oriental metropolitan centres, but in any case they were still indefinite—an indefiniteness which really told in favour of Rome down to the beginning of the fourth century. The Acts of a Roman synod held under Silvester describe its members as including 284 (Italian) bishops, 57 Egyptian bishops, 142 Roman priests, 6 deacons, 6 subdeacons, 45 acolytes, 22 exorcists, and 90 readers from Rome, with 14 notaries. But as the Acts are a forgery, these numbers are worthless.

[1] Who had not long ago been consecrated with the help of sixteen bishops (cp. Cypr., *ep.* lv. 24).

[2] The story also shows that the Roman bishop's metropolitan or higher metropolitan authority extended even this length.

[3] A synod was held at Rome shortly before that of Cornelius, during the vacancy in the papacy. Novatian (Cypr., *ep.* xxx. 8), says of it: "Nos . . . . et quidem multi et quidem cum quibusdam episcopis vicinis nobis et adpropinquantibus et quos ex aliis provinciis longe positis persecutionis istius ardor eiecerat" ("We . . . . in large numbers, and moreover with some neighbouring bishops

that the higher metropolitan jurisdiction of Rome embraced not less than a hundred episcopates about 250 A.D. From which it follows that the leading cities generally would almost all have Christians within their walls.[1]

Churches can be traced in the following towns[2]:—

Puteoli (Acts xxviii. 13 f.).[3]

Naples (the catacombs render it probable that there were Christians here as early as the second century; see also *Liber Pontif.*, s.v. "Silvester." The local Jews must have been numerous from a very early period).

Antium (Hippol., *Philos.*, ix. 12).[4]

[so that there must have been some in the adjoining towns] and some within reach, and some who had been driven away by the heat of that persecution from other provinces at a long distance"). It is remarkable that bishops, when forced to flee, made their way to Rome.

[1] The remark of the papal list (s.v. "Silvester"; cp. Duchesne, pp. cxxxv. f.), and other sources, to the effect that Silvester held a synod of 275 bishops, after the council of Nicæa, may be correct. But I pass over this point. It was not the same synod as that mentioned above.

[2] Hermes (*Vis.*, ii. 4) unfortunately does not name the "outside cities" (ἔξω πόλεις) to which a certain booklet was to be sent. They need not have been in Italy. One of the teachers of Clem. Alex. stayed in Greece (*Strom.*, i. 1; cp. Eus., v. 11).

[3] Nissen (*Italische Landeskunde*, II. i. (1902), p. 122), ranks Puteoli in the first class of Italian towns, with regard to the number of inhabitants. The evidence for Christians in Pompeii is unreliable, as also for the existence of local Jews. On the other hand, Puteoli had a strong community of Jews, and the *Acta Petri* vi. (Vercell.) presuppose the existence of local Christians.

[4] A church must have been attached to the cemetery at Antium, over which Callistus was set by Zephyrinus.—Jews (cp. Schol. on Juv., *Satir.*, iv. 117 f.), but not Christians (despite the *Acta Petri* vi.). are to be traced at Aricia.

Portus (Hipp.; Synod of Arles in 316 A.D.).[1]

Ostia (Synod of Rome[2] in 313 A.D.; *Lib. Pontif.*, s.v. "Silvester").

Albano (*Lib. Pontif.*, s.v. "Silvester").

Fundi (*Lib. Pontif.*, s.v. "Anteros").

Amiternum, near Aquila (*Texte u. Unters.*, xi. 2, p. 46).

Aureus Mons, or some other locality in Picenum (*ibid.*, pp. 47, 53).

Tres Tabernæ (Synod of Rome, 313 A.D.).

Sinna [Cæsena? Segni?] (*ibid.*).

Quintianum (*ibid.*).

Rimini (*ibid.*).

Florence (*ibid.*).

Pisa (*ibid.*).

Faënza (*ibid.*).

Forum Claudii [Oriolo] (*ibid.*).

Capua (*ibid.*, Arles 316 A.D.; *Lib. Pontif.*, s.v. "Silvester." There was also a local Jewish community).

Terracina (*ibid.*; cp. *Acta Pet. et Pauli* 12, and *Acta Ner. et Achill.*).

Prænestê (*ibid.*).

Ursinum (*ibid.*).

Beneventum (*ibid.*).

Syracuse (Cyprian;[3] Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5, 21; Arles, 316 A.D.).

[1] For the signatures to the council of Arles, cp. Routh's *Reliq. Sacr.*(3), iii. pp. 312 f.

[2] For the signatures to this synod (nineteen bishops), cp. Routh, pp. 280 f.

[3] The earliest proof of any Christian churches in Sicily is furnished by Cyprian's thirtieth epistle, c. v., although the Christian catacombs may actually go back as far as the second century. This epistle

Civita Vecchia (Arles, 316 A.D.).
Civitas Arpiensium [in Apulia] (Arles, 316 A.D.).
Cagliari (*ibid.*).[1]
[Gaeta] (*Acta Petri et Pauli* 12).

In the towns now to be mentioned, the existence of Christian churches (or bishoprics) is proved from martyrdoms and various notices. Such sources are not absolutely reliable in every case, but when one reflects that there were certainly about a hundred bishops in Italy *circa* 250 A.D., it becomes *a priori* probable, on this ground alone, that these towns had Christian churches in them. They are as follows:—

Ancona.
Aquila.
Ascoli Pic.
Assisi.
Avellino.
Baccano (Baccanas in Etruria).
Bettona.

informs us that during the Decian persecution letters were sent by the Roman clergy to Sicily. As Syracuse was certainly the capital of Sicily in the fourth century, there must have been a local church in existence about 250 A.D. Cp. Führer's *Forsch. zur Sicilia Sotteranea* (1897), pp. 170 f. Out of all the other Silician catacombs which Führer has enumerated and described, there is not one which I would venture to assign to the pre-Constantine period, although Schultze (*Archæol. Studien*, 1880, pp. 123 f.) believes that he can deduce from the evidence of the monuments the existence of a Christian church at Syracuse by the second century, and even by the opening of that century.

[1] For Christians in the mines of Sardinia, cp. Hipp., *Philos.*, ix. 12; *Catal. Liber.*, s.v. "Pontian"; probably also, at an earlier date, Dionys. Cor., in Eus., *H.E.*, iv. 23.—Eusebius, who became bishop of Vercelli in 340, came from Sardinia.

Catania.[1]
Cumæ.
Fano.
Ferentino.
Fermo.
Girgenti.
Hybla maior.
Leontion.
Lucca.
Messina (so *Acta Pauli et Petri* 7).
Nocera.
Nola (the martyr Felix).
Perugia.
Salerno.
Sipontum.
Spoleto.
Taormina.
Teano.
Terni.
Todi.
Trani.

We can probably assume that a Christian church

[1] The *Acta Felicis* prove the existence of Christian churches in Girgenti, Catania (so, too, the *Acta Euplii*), Messina, and Taormina. Venosa, again, which is mentioned in these *Acta* also, appears to have contained no Christians, although this is not quite certain (it had a Jewish community). I have passed over the bishops (or bishoprics) mentioned in the *Liber Predest.*, but as it is probable that ch. xvi. rests upon a sound, though misunderstood, tradition, and as it mentions bishop Eustachius of Lilybæum and Theodorus of Panormus, there is a certain probability of bishoprics having existed in these places about the year 300, and of a Sicilian synod having been held about that time.—On the post-Constantine date of the Maltese catacombs in general, see Mayr, *Röm. Quartalschrift*, XV. iii., pp. 216 f.

existed at Clusium (in Etruria), as the cemetery of S. Catherine appears to belong to the third century (see Bormann in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, xi. pp. 403 f.)

Lower Italy, as our survey shows, had unquestionably a larger number of Christian churches than Middle Italy. The state of matters which prevailed in the interior of Middle Italy, and in fact not very far from the coast, even as late as the opening of the sixth century, is revealed by the history of Benedict of Nursia. It is impossible to ascertain the exact number of bishoprics *circa* 325 A.D., or whether they had increased since 100 A.D.

§ 15. Upper Italy and the Romagna.

Not merely from negative evidence, but from the history of the church in these districts (which stood apart, however, in politics and culture) during the fourth and fifth centuries, is it rendered certain that Christianity entered them late and slowly, and that it was still scanty in the year 325 A.D.[1] As it passed from East to West in Upper Italy, Christianity must have fallen off and become more and more sparse. Before 325 we have no trustworthy account of any

[1] As I have already (pp. 64 f.) gone into it with some thoroughness, I do not take up at this point the passage in Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the Pauline epistles (Swete, vol. ii. 1882, pp. 121 f.). "In every province there were usually two, or at most three bishops, at first—a state of matters which prevailed till recently in most of the Western provinces, and which may be found still in one or two of them. As time went on, however, bishops were ordained not only in towns but also in small districts." The fourth canon of Nicæa presupposes that in none of the Eastern provinces were there fewer than four bishops.

Christians in Piedmont and Liguria.[1] The sole exception is Genoa, and even that is doubtful. The first bishopric in Piedmont was not established till after the middle of the fourth century (cp. Savio's *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia. Il Piemonte*, 1898).[2]

The eastern side of Upper Italy, however, can be shown to have possessed several bishoprics, from whose subsequent demeanour and position it is plain that their authority was derived ("auctoritas praesto erat") hardly from Rome but from the Balkan peninsula. Ecclesiastically, it was a longer road from Rome to Ravenna and Aquileia than from Sirmium, Sardica, and Thessalonica. And this state of matters

[1] The statement of Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.*, ii. 32) about the divine religion being received only at a later period on the other side of the Alps ("serius trans Alpes dei religione suscepta," see below) may have also referred to the Maritime Alps.

[2] In his *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, I.[(2)] (p. 26), Hauck believes he can prove from Ambros. *epist.* i. 63 that a number of the bishoprics in Upper Italy had not been long in existence by the time of Ambrose. I do not doubt this. Only I would not like to base it on the passage in question. Ambrose is writing to the church of Vercelli, and he proceeds: "I am consumed with grief, because the church of God in your midst has not a priest yet, it being the only one destitute of such an official in all Liguria or Æmilia or Venetia or the rest of the lands bordering on Italy" ("Conficior dolore, quia ecclesia domini, quae est in vobis, sacerdotem adhuc non habet ac sola nunc ex omnibus Liguriae atque Aemiliae Venetiarumque vel ceteris finitimis partibus Italiæ huiusmodi eget officio)." Hauck recalls, correctly enough, that the bishopric of Vercelli was several decades old when Ambrose wrote, so that "adhuc non habet" means simply a temporary vacancy, while he infers from "nunc ex omnibus" that the bishoprics of all the Upper Italian churches were of recent origin. But, if "adhuc non" merely denotes a temporary vacancy, one can hardly take what follows in a different sense.

did not originate in the fourth century; on the contrary, it was not till then that, owing to the new political conditions of the age, the Roman church wielded an almost imperceptible influence over these towns and districts. The bishoprics were as follows:—

Ravenna (its twelfth bishop was at Sardica, 343 A.D.).

Mailand (synod of Rome, 313 A.D.; its seventh bishop was at Arles, 316 A.D.).

Aquileia (synod of Arles).

Brescia (its fifth bishop was at Sardica).

Verona (its sixth bishop was at Sardica).

Bologna (*Mart. Vitalis et Agricolae;* see also *Martyriol. Syriacum*).

Imola (Mart.).

The evidence of martyrdoms is uncertain upon the existence of churches at Padua (though here the existence of a church is probable on *a priori* grounds), Bergamo, Como, and Genoa.[1]

The insignificance of the churches even in the larger towns of Upper Italy about the year 300, seems to me to be proved by a passage from Paulinus Mediol. (*Vita Ambrosii* 14), where we read

[1] St Martin of Tours, when a lad of ten (*i.e., circa* 326–329 A.D.), stayed at Pavia along with his father, who was an officer of high rank. As Sulpicius Severus (*Vita Martini* 2) remarks that "he fled to the church against his parents' wishes, when a lad of ten, and demanded to be received as a catechumen" ("cum esset annorum decem, invitis parentibus, ad ecclesiam fugit seque catechumenum fieri postulavit"), it follows that there must have been a Christian church in those days at Pavia.—The first bishop of Padua of whom we possess reliable information falls in the reign of Constans. There is no trace of bishoprics at Como or Bergamo till the reign of Theodosius I.

that "on the invitation of the Florentines, Ambrose travelled down as far as Tuscany . . . . and erected a basilica in the city, where he placed the remains of the martyrs Vitalis and Agricola, whose bodies he had exhumed in Bologna. *For the bodies of the martyrs had been buried amongst the bodies of the Jews*, nor was their location known to the saints, had not the holy martyrs revealed it to the priest" ("Invitatus Ambrosius a Florentinis ad Tusciam usque descendit . . . . in eadem civitate basilicam constituit, in qua deposuit reliquias martyrum Vitalis et Agricolae, quorum corpora in Bononiensi civitate levaverat. posita enim erant corpora martyrum inter corpora Judaeorum, nec erat cognitum populo Christiano, nisi se sancti martyres sacerdoti ipsi revelarent"). The Christian community at Bologna would seem therefore to have been still so small at the time of the Diocletian persecution, that it had no church building of its own.[1]

[1] I must refrain from entering into any details upon the previous history of the church in the three great centres, Ravenna, Mailand, and Aquileia. The legends of Ravenna assign the eleventh and twelfth bishops a reign, between them, of 116 years, in order to run the twelve bishops (dating back from 348 A.D.) back to Peter. If the twelfth bishop of Ravenna attended the synod of Sardica, the local church may have been founded by the opening of the third century. In the early Byzantine period, Mailand claimed to have been founded by the apostle Barnabas, and consequently to be the only directly apostolic church in the West, besides Rome. This claim, however, is untenable. The fact of seven bishops having ruled till 316 A.D. suggests that the bishopric (and the church) was not founded long before the middle of the third century.—The founding of the church at the large town of Aquileia falls at a still later period, probably not until the Diocletian era, or shortly before it.

§ 16. Gaul, Belgium, Germany, and Rhætia.

On the shores of the Mediterranean and in the Rhone valley, where the Greek[1] population was in close touch with Asia, Christianity established itself[2] not later than about the middle of the second century. While the evidence as regards Marseilles, however, is only inferential[3] (since the inscription which vouches for local Christianity cannot be assigned with absolute certainty to the second century), Vienna and Lyons are attested by the letter sent from the local Christians to the churches of Asia and Phrygia *à propos* of the persecution in 177 A.D. (Eus., *H.E.*, v. 1 f.), while Lyons[4] is visible

[1] On Hellenism in Southern Gaul, cp. Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. pp. 100 f. (Eng. trans., i. 110 f.), Caspari's *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, vol. iii. (1875), and Zahn's *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, i. pp. 39 f., 44 f. At the opening of the fifth century, monasticism in the maritime districts of Southern Gaul was still in close touch with Eastern monasticism, forming in fact the last great proof of a living connection between that seaboard and the East. Even in the third century, however, Greek must have continued to be the language of educated people in Southern Gaul far more than Latin.

[2] For Christians in the valley of the Rhone, see Irenæus (I. xiii. 7), who speaks of the vicious activity displayed by adherents of the gnostic Marcion: ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς κλίμασι τῆς Ῥοδανουσίας πολλὰς ἐξηπατήκασι γυναῖκας ("In our own districts of the Rhone they have deluded many women").

[3] The church of Lyons could not have been Greek at all, unless Greek Christianity had existed at the estuary of the Rhone.

[4] On the peculiar political position of Lyons in Gaul, see Mommsen's *Röm. Geschichte*, v. pp. 79 f. (Eng. trans., i. p. 87 f.). The percentage of inhabitants who spoke Greek in Lyons cannot have been large, as "unlike any other in Northern Gaul, and unlike the large majority of the Southern, it was founded from Italy, and was a Roman city, not only as regards its rights but in origin and character." The local church, nevertheless, was still predominantly Greek *circa* 190 A.D.

during the last two decades of the second century through the works of Irenæus. From the former document we see that Lyons had a bishopric by 177 A.D. Vienna was not far from Lyons, although it was in a different province (Narbonensis), but the relationship disclosed by the epistle as subsisting between the two churches is obscure, and we may question, with Duchesne (*Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. i. 1894), whether Vienna had a bishop of its own at that date. This is not the place, however, to go into such a problem (see above, pp. 84 f.). Suffice it to say that it had a Christian community. I cannot accept the opinion that Vienna was quite untouched by the persecution (Neumann, *der römische Staat und die allgem. Kirche*, i. 1890, p. 29, note).

All that can be ascertained with regard to the church-history of Lyons down to the days of Constantine has been carefully put together by Hirschfeld ("zur Geschichte des Christ. in Lugdunum vor Konstantin" in the *Sitzungsberichte d. K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1895, pp. 381 f.). I single out the following points.

1. The church must have been predominantly Greek in the days of Irenæus. This follows from the Greek language of the letter and of the works of Irenæus, as well as from the names of those who perished in the persecution. Still, as these names indicate, a Latin element was not awanting either.

2. The church cannot have been large; for, although the persecution was extremely severe, and although it affected the whole church, the number of the victims did not amount to more than forty-nine. Hirschfeld, who (*op. cit.*, pp. 385 f.) has made an

accurate study of the list of their names, so far as these have been handed down, throws out the conjecture, which is not unfounded, that the number was even smaller, inasmuch as the public name and the cognomen are probably separated, and thus individuals have been doubled. The paucity of the church members follows also from the fact that a list of the surviving adherents of the faith was in existence, even as late as Eusebius (though he has not reproduced it). At this point also one must recollect the general evidence as to the beginnings of Christianity in Gaul, which we possess, *e.g.*, in Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.*, ii. 32: "Sub Aurelio deinde, Antonini filio, persecutio quinta agitata; ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa, serius trans Alpes dei religione suscepta" ("Then under Eusebius, the son of Antoninus, the fifth persecution broke out. And at last martyrdoms were seen in Gaul, the divine religion having been late of being accepted across the Alps"). In the *Passio Saturnini* (of Toulouse) we also read—"... after the sound of the gospel stole out gradually and by degrees into all the earth, and the preaching of the apostles shone throughout our country with but a slow progress, since only a few churches in some of the states, and these thinly filled with Christians, stood up together for the faith" ("Postquam sensim et gradatim in omnem terram evangeliorum sonus exivit tardoque progressu in regionibus nostris apostolorum praedicatio coruscavit, cum rarae in aliquibus civitatibus ecclesiae paucorum Christianorum devotione consurgerent"). We may reject, as totally untrustworthy, the statement made by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.*, i. 29:

"Irenæus . . . . in modici temporis spatio praedicatione sua maxime in integrum civitatem reddidit Christianam"), to the effect that "in a short space of time Irenæus made the whole city Christian again by his preaching."

3. Among several other unreliable data upon Christians in Lyons during the third century, the epitaph of a "libellicus" falls to be noted (*i.e.* of an official in charge of the "libelli" during the reign of Decius? Hirschfeld, p. 397), as well as a certain bishop Helius of Lyons "tempore paganorum" (Gregor. Tours, *Gloria Confess.* 61). It is certain that during the age of Cyprian (*ep.* lxviii. 1) Faustinus was bishop of Lyons, and that the synod of Arles (316 A.D.) was attended by a bishop from Lyons called Voccius (Vocius ?).

Irenæus relates that he had to preach in Celtic,[1] that there were churches ἐν Κέλτοις (I. x. 2), and that there were Christians among the Celts, who possessed the orthodox faith "without ink or paper."[2] The statement that his emissaries reached Valentia and Vesontio is perhaps trustworthy (see Hirschfeld, pp. 393 f.), but we must certainly form modest ideas of the results of the Celtic mission during the third

[1] *Contr. haer.* pref., οὐκ ἐπιζητήσεις παρ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐν Κέλτοις διατριβόντων καὶ περὶ βάρβαρον διάλεκτον τὸ πλεῖστον ἀσχολουμένων λόγων τέχνην.

[2] III. iv. 1: "Cui ordinationi assentiunt multae gentes barbarorum [primarily Celts and Germans are in the writer's mind] eorum qui in Christum credunt, sive charta vel atramento scriptam habentes per spiritum in cordibus suis salutem et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes," etc. ("In agreement with which are many barbarian nations, who believe in Christ, having salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts, and not with ink or pen, who preserve, however, the ancient tradition with care"). Small store is to be

century. What may be read in the *Historia Francorum* (ix. 3) as to the Western district, where the origins of Christianity do not fall earlier than the fourth century, holds true of many other parts of the country. But it is otherwise with the larger towns.[1] These, however, owing to the peculiar constitution of the country, were not numerous, and only developed by degrees. As against Duchesne, I am unable to understand Eus., *H.E.*, v. 23 (cp. above, pp. 76 f., 86 f.), except as meaning that when the Paschal controversy was raging, about the year 190, there were *several* bishopries in Gaul (*τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπισπόρει*, "parishes in Gaul superintended by Irenæus," cp. v. 24. 11), and that their occupants held a synod at that period under the presidency of Irenæus. For these bishops we must look in the first instance to provincia Narbonensis, and the sixty-eighth epistle of Cyprian proves that about the year 255 A.D., at least, there was a bishopric at Arles. Rightly read, however, this epistle further teaches us that there was an episcopal synod held not only in the province of Narbonensis but also in that of Lyons, while *c.* 190 A.D. they still seem to have formed a single synod. Hence it follows that several Gallic bishopries, whose

set by the passage in Tertullian's *adv. Jud.* vii. ("Galliarum diversae nationes Christo subditae" = "different nations of Gaul, subjugated to Christ"). More weight attaches to Hippolytus, *Philos.*, x. 34. From the passages in Irenæus one gets the impression that he must have spoken more Celtic than Greek.

[1] I leave aside the legends—*e.g.*, that of seven bishops being sent from Rome to Gaul during the days of Pope Xystus II., with the consequent founding of the churches of Tours, Arles, Narbonne, Toulouse, Paris, Clermont, and Limoges.

origin Duchesne would relegate to the second half of the third century, arose as early as the first half of that century, in fact even by the end of the second century. *A priori*, it is probable that at one time Lyons had the sole episcopal see in the provincia Lugdunensis and Belgica, although this cannot have lasted for very long. It is utterly improbable, however, that Lyons was always *the* bishopric for the provincia Narbonensis.

Special notices of the Gallic bishoprics are first furnished by the lists of the synods of Rome (313) and Arles (316), as well as by a couple of martyrdoms. The following are indubitable:—

In Narbon.—Vienna (cp. the epistle, *Mart.*, Arles). Arles (Marcian, the bishop in the days of Cyprian, was an adherent of Novatian; bishop Marinus attended the synod of Rome, cp. Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5. 19; at the synod of Arles there were forty-three churches represented, from most of the Western provinces).

Marseilles (Arles).
Vaison (Arles).
Nizza [Portus Nicænus] (Arles).
Orange (Arles).
Apt (Arles).
Toulouse (*Mart.*, also trustworthy inferences from later periods).

In Lugdun.—Lyons (cp. the epistle, Iren., Faustinus, who was bishop in the days of Cyprian, Arles).

Autun (Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5. 19; bishop Reticius at Rome, 313).
Rouen (Arles).
Diê (council of Nicæa, 325).

Paris (*Mart.*; also trustworthy inferences from later periods).
Sens (*Mart.*; also trustworthy inferences from later periods).
In Aquitania.—Bordeaux (Arles).
Eauze (Arles).
Mendê (Arles).
Bourges (Arles).
In Belg.—Treves (Arles).
Rheims (Arles).

The investigations of Duchesne render it probable that there were Christians, but scarcely bishoprics,[1] during the pre-Constantine period in Angers, Auxerre, Beauvais, Châlons, Chartres, Clermont, Digne, Embrun, Grenoble, Langres, Limoges, Metz, Nantes, Narbonne, Noyon, Orleans, Senlis, Soissons, Toul, Troyes, Verdun, and Viviers. Previous to Constans, Tours had no church (Greg., *Hist. Franc.*, x. 31). Were there martyrs in Amiens or Agen?

Eusebius declares that Constantine Chlorus did not destroy the church buildings in Gaul (*H.E.*, viii. 13.

[1] At the same time, if even a small town like Diê had a bishop in 325 (who may have been a personal friend of Constantine—for this is the only unforced explanation of the fact that he was the sole bishop from Gaul at the Nicene council), then we must assume that the episcopate was much more widely spread throughout Gaul than we are able to show in detail. By the days of Hilary of Poitiers (359 A.D.) the episcopal organization of the country had made great strides, but there is certainly plenty of time between 312 and 359 for the addition of many bishoprics. Important towns may have had Christian communities, without any bishops, for a long period of time, but one can scarcely appeal with much confidence in favour of this conjecture to the declaration made by bishop Proculus of Marseilles to the synod of Turin (in 401 A.D.). In order to justify his claim to metropolitan rights

13), so that there must have been buildings of this kind. Lactantius, however (*de mort.* xv.), relates that he "allowed the churches, *i.e.* mere walls which could be restored, to be demolished" ("Conventicula, *i.e.* parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est").

By the opening of the fourth century the church must have come to play a rôle of its own in the towns of Southern Gaul. This is suggested by one consideration of a psychological nature. Would Constantine, it may be asked, have declared himself in favour of the church, if he had had always to live alongside an infinitesimally small Christendom during the years which he spent in Gaul[1] immediately previous to his great change of front? I doubt it. The Oriental reminiscences of the church's early size are insufficient. But, in any case, one must not immediately argue from its importance to its size, nor must one forget the necessity of carefully distinguishing between the various towns (occasionally in process of transition from military encampments to actual towns[2]) and districts, especially between those of the north and of the south. Certainly in

over Narb. II., he speaks of "easdem ecclesias vel suas parochias fuisse vel episcopos a se in iisdem ecclesiis ordinatos." We do not know where these parishes ("parochiæ") are to be sought; but they may have been small towns in the immediate vicinity of Marseilles.

[1] In earlier days a typically Gallic Christianity, such as that of Northern Africa, can hardly be said to have existed. Irenæus is a Christian of Asia Minor, not of Latin Gaul, nor did the Gallic church, as a Latin church, produce any prominent figure till Hilary of Poitiers. Gallic rhetoric then made its way into the church, which it stamped with an impress of its own.

[2] On the cantonal divisions of Gaul, see Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 81 f (Eng. trans., i. p. 90 f.).

Belgica the church was still in a very humble way about 300 A.D., as is plain from its most important town, Treves, whose bishopric (first occupied by Eucharius and Valerius) was not founded till the second half of the third century. "Even by the opening of the fourth century, the number of members in this church was small. One little building sufficed for their worship down to 336 A.D., nor were steps taken towards the erection of a new edifice till Athanasius stayed there, during his banishment" (Athan., *Apol. ad Constant.* 15; cp. Hauck's *KG. Deutschlands*[2], i. p. 28). Treves does not seem to have got its second church till the beginning of the fifth century. During all the fourth century the town remained substantially pagan, and what was true of Treves was practically true of Gaul itself, apart from the south-west and the districts of the Rhone, to judge from the evidence furnished by the fourth and fifth centuries. A Christianizing movement upon a larger scale began during the second half of the fourth century, but it did not produce any far-reaching effects, nor was it till after the middle of the fifth century that Gaul, *i.e.* its Roman population, became substantially Christian. Nay, about 400 A.D. the world of Gallic culture was still pagan first and foremost. All our witnesses for the period place this beyond dispute.[1] The religion of the country no longer presented any serious obstacle to the church; but the Celtic element was overcome by Latin Christianity rather than by the German immigration (Mommsen, p. 92; Eng. trans., i. p. 103 f.).

[1] For the overthrow of paganism in Gaul, see Schultze, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 101 f.

The church-history of Germany begins with the well-known statement of Irenæus, i. 10 (*οὔτε αἱ ἐν Γερμανίαις ἱδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἄλλως πεπιστεύκασιν ἢ ἄλλως παραδιδόασιν*): "Nor were the faith and tradition of the churches planted in Germany at all different." Irenæus obviously refers to stable, *i.e.* episcopal churches, for only such churches could hand down any traditions; so that it is certain that in the largest Roman towns of Germany (of which Cologne and Mainz occur immediately to our minds), there were Christian communities and bishops as early as the year 185 A.D. Unluckily all other evidence fails us at this point, nor are the episcopal lists of any value in this connection. All we know is that the bishop of Cologne was at Rome (in 313 A.D.; cp. Eus., x. 5. 19) and at Arles (316 A.D.).[1] Yet how small must the church have been, if even by 355 A.D. it had no more than one "little conventicle" ("conventiculum," Amm. Marc., xv. 5. 31).[2] This of itself

[1] Maternus, bishop of Cologne, must have been Constantine's special confidential adviser, for it was he who, together with the bishops of Rome, Arles, and Autun, was entrusted with the preliminary investigation into the Donatist question. But the bishop's personal importance is not decisive for the size of his episcopate. From Theodos., *Cod.*, xvi. 8. 3, we find that there was a synagogue also at Cologne in the reign of Constantine.

[2] Even the notices of martyrs in Germany (at Cologne and Treves) are quite uncertain, if not absolutely untrustworthy. Hauck (*op. cit.*, p. 25) considers that only the account of Clematius at Cologne can be termed even "fairly authentic." It describes (fourth century or fifth) the spot "where the holy virgins shed their blood for the name of Christ ("ubi sanctae virgines pro nomine Christi sanguinem suum fuderunt"). It also mentions an old basilica, or memorial chapel, perhaps built in honour of these virgins during the reign of Constantine.

is enough to show that Christianity was an extremely weak plant throughout all Germany.

In Lower Germany, Tongern may still be claimed perhaps as a pre-Constantine bishopric; at any rate, not long after Constantine, the town had a bishop, Servatius, who is known from his connection with the Arian controversy. In Upper Germany there is no evidence of any bishopric or church before Constantine; but as it lay much nearer to Lyons than to Lower Germany, it is not necessary perhaps to restrict the range of Irenæus's statement to the latter district (cp. the instance of Vesontio, already noted).[1] The earliest evidence for a church at Mainz occurs in 368 A.D., when the greater part of the inhabitants were already Christians (Amm. Marc., xxvii. 10). Jerome (*ep.* cxxiii. 16) explains how ("multa milia hominum") "many thousands of people" were slain *in the church*, when the city was sacked by the Germans. This occurred, however, at the opening of the fifth century.

As for Rhætia, we can trace Christian churches at Augsburg and Regensburg before Constantine; for the personality of St Afra the martyr is beyond doubt, and graves of martyrs have been discovered at Regensburg (cp. Hauck, p. 347). Beyond this, however, no sure footing is possible.[2]

[1] Tertullian mentions Christians among the Germans (*adv. Jud.* vii.), but the rhetorical nature of the passage renders it untrustworthy as a piece of evidence.

[2] In the great enumeration of the ecclesiastical provinces given by Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arian.* i.), Germany is never mentioned, although even Britain is included. This is the less accidental, as Germany is also passed over in the similar enumeration of *Vita Const.*, iii. 19, where both Gaul and Britain are named. So still in Optatus, *de schism.*, ii. 1 and iii. 9. For Origen, see above, p. 160.

§ 17. England.

At first Christianity could not gain any firm footing[1] in this province, which was really a military province and only veneered with Roman influence.[2] Tertullian's notice (in *adv. Jud.* vii.) is of no consequence, and still less weight attaches to the legend of a correspondence between the Roman bishop Eleutherus and an alleged king of Britain called Lucius[3] (*Lib. Pontif.*, also Bede's *Hist. Angl.*, i. 4). Still it is quite possible that Christians had arrived in Britain and laboured there by the end of the second century. We may assume that the accounts given by Gildas and Bede of the martyrs Alban in Verulam (St Albans) and two others in Legionum Urbs (Cærleon)—during the Diocletian persecution—rest on some reliable tradition.[4] But the British church emerges into daylight first of all

[1] *Early* Christian inscriptions are totally lacking.

[2] "The language and customs that penetrated thither from Italy remained an exotic growth in the island even more than upon the continent" (Mommsen, *op. cit.*, v. p. 176; Eng. trans., i. 193).

[3] Lucius is Lucius Abgar of Edessa, and his British kingship is due to a confusion (see my study in the *Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1904, pp. 909 f.).—Origen presupposes the presence of Christians in Britain (*Hom. IV. in Ezek.*, tom. 14, p. 59).

[4] The utter silence of our sources upon the church-history of Britain during the third century is perhaps intelligible. "Hardly anything is told us about the fortunes of the island, from the third century" (Mommsen, p. 172; Eng. trans., i. 189).—The martyrdom of Alban cannot be pronounced quite authentic, as the oldest sources declare that no martyrdoms occurred during the reign of Constantius Chlorus. Still, this statement does not preclude the occurrence of one or two. Even previous to Gildas (*circa* 430 A.D.), relics of the saint can be shown to have existed.

through the fact of three bishops,[1] from London, York, and Lincoln (though the name of this locality is uncertain), having attended the synod of Arles in 316 A.D. Two of these bishops bear classical names, but the third is indigenous (Eborius). If three bishops from Britain were present at Arles, we are justified in concluding that the number of British bishoprics was more numerous still. Only, we know nothing whatever on this point. All we do know is that Britain was rapidly Christianized in the course of the fourth century,[2] when the native population became practically Christian, while the tribes of Germany continued to remain almost entirely pagan.

§ 18. Africa, Numidia, Mauretania, and Tripolitana.[3]

The strip of coast lying between the sea and the mountain-range upon the southern coast of the western Mediterranean belongs to Europe, not to Africa. During the imperial age, the most import-

[1] In accordance with the division of the country into shires, the Latin towns of Britain rose as gradually as those of Gaul. York was the headquarters of the army, while Camalodunum probably formed the civil capital. It is noticeable that no trace of a bishop can be found at the former town or at the trading centre of London, until a comparatively late period.

[2] It is perhaps worthy of notice that, when the synod of Rimini met, with an attendance of over four hundred bishops, three British bishops alone accepted the imperial provision for the upkeep of members (Sulpic. Sever., *Chron.*, ii. 41: "Inopia proprii publico usi sunt" = they availed themselves of the public fund, owing to lack of private means—which appeared unbecoming, "indecens," to their fellow bishops). This implies that the churches were still poor.

[3] See Leclercq, *l'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904).

ant province in this part, *i.e.* Africa proconsularis, was a second Italy. The country reached its zenith of prosperity between the end of the second and the close of the third century.

During this period, when the Romanizing of the country made its greatest advances,[1] the Christian church attained a growth within this wide and fruitful province which was only paralleled in Asia Minor. But previously to this, the church of Carthage, which is the earliest of the great Latin churches, must have been of importance, ere ever it emerges into the light of history. The early writings of Tertullian presuppose a large church in the capital as well as the extension of Christianity throughout Northern Africa.[2] But one thing surprises us, and it is this. Tertullian tells us next to nothing of the early history of the

[1] Many natives even of the better classes still spoke Latin with reluctance in the second century; cp. Apuleius, *Apol.* lxviii. (of a young man), "Loquitur numquam nisi punice, et si quid adhuc a matre graecissat; enim Latine neque vult neque potest" ("He never speaks anything but Punic or a smattering of Greek picked up from his mother; Latin he neither can nor will attempt"). The language of educated people, with which the superimposed Latin of these North African provinces had to reckon, was Greek. The "suaviludii," or lovers of the play, at Carthage in Tertullian's day (cp. *de corona* vi.), preferred to read Greek rather than Latin, and for their benefit Tertullian wrote his *de spectaculis* in Greek (see Zahn's *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, i. p. 49). The Barbary vernacular had been long ago displaced from public usage by the Punic inhabitants. It waned still further under the Roman régime, though it still survived in the intercourse of foreign rulers. On the Latinizing of Africa by means of the settlement of Italian colonists in the country, see Mommsen's *Röm. Gesch.*, v. p. 647 (Eng. trans., ii. 332 f.).

[2] Particular account must be taken of *ad Scap.* ii. v.: "Tanta hominum multitudo, pars paene maior civitatis cuiusque" ("Such are our numbers, amounting almost to a majority of the citizens

Carthaginian church, and as little of the other churches in Africa—even of their contemporary history indeed. For Tertullian remained the citizen of a great city, even when he became a Christian. The country was no concern of his; and, besides, he lived wholly in the present and the future.

Nothing is known to us of the primitive Greek period of the African church. We learn, however, that Perpetua conversed in Greek with bishop Optatus and the presbyter Aspasius, while Tertullian also wrote in Greek as well as in Latin. The Greek versions of the primitive Acts of the African martyrs may be almost as old as the Acts themselves,[1] and it is with martyrdoms, primarily in the year 180, that the church-history of Northern Africa commences. At that period Namphano of Madaura and several

in every city"): "Tanta milia hominum, tot viri ac feminae omnis sexus, omnis aetatis, omnis dignitatis" ("So many thousands of people, so many men and women, people of both sexes, of every age, of every rank"): "Quid ipsa Carthago passura est, decimanda a te" ("What will Carthage herself suffer, if you must decimate her?"): "Parce Carthagini, si non tibi, parce provinciae, quae visâ intentione tua obnoxia facta est concussionibus" ("Have mercy on Carthage, if not on yourself; have mercy on the province which, by the disclosure of your purpose, has been rendered liable to acts of extortion"). Similar remarks occur even in his earlier (*circa* 197 A.D.) *Apology*; cp. chaps. ii. and xxxvii.—Unfortunately, we have not the slightest information upon the relations subsisting between primitive African Christianity and the innumerable synagogues of the country.

[1] From its very foundation, a special tie must have continued to exist between the African church and that of Rome (Tertull., *de praescr.* xxxvi.: "Roma unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est" = Rome, whence we too derive this our authority), but we know no details of this, and it does not necessarily follow that Roman Christians brought the gospel to Africa. The relations of the church with Jerusalem, which Augustine affirms, are abstract.

Christians from Scilium (a town which must have been situated in proconsular Numidia) were all put to death.[1] We have thus evidence for Christians in Numidia as early as for Christians in Carthage. The works of Tertullian prove the existence of Christian churches in four towns of Africa, and only four, viz., Hadrumetum, Thysdrus, Lambæsa, and Uthina. All of these were places of importance, Lambæsa in Numidia being the chief military depôt in Africa.[2] As Hadrumetum and Thysdrus lay in Byzacium (*ad Scap.* iii.–iv.), the latter province must also have contained Christians by this time. And even in Mauretania they were to be found, for Tertullian (*op. cit.* iv.) mentions a bloody persecution of the local Christians by the governor of Mauretania. We have his testimony, therefore, to the existence of Christians in Numidia,[3] Byzacium, and Mauretania.[4]

[1] From the *Vita Cypriani per Pontium* (i., cp. xix.) it follows that no cleric was martyred at all in Africa, previous to Cyprian, *i.e.* to 258 A.D. This is extremely remarkable. The clergy knew how to live on good terms with the authorities, as is plain from the bitter complaints about the "deer-footed" clergy and their method of evading a threatening persecution by means of bribery (Tert., *de fuga in persecut.*). Tertullian's treatise *ad Martyres* shows that up till the date of its composition there had been very few martyrs in Africa. He refers not to early Christian martyrs, but to Lucretia, Regulus, etc.

[2] Lambæsa is meant in *ad Scap.* iv. ("Nam et nunc a praeside Legionis vexatur hoc nomen" = for even at present our Name is being harried by the governor of Legio).

[3] Cp. also the story of Vespronius Candidus in *ad Scap.* iv; he was "legatus Augusti pro praetore" in Numidia (*CIL*, vol. viii. n. 8782).

[4] The existence of quite a number of bishops in Africa as early as 200 A.D. is proved by the passage in *de fuga* xi., which speaks of bishops who had fled during the persecution.

We have no information upon the strength of the Punic element in the church about the year 200 or during the course of the third century. Tertullian and Cyprian tell us practically nothing about it, and we might suppose it did not exist at all. But in the fourth century (cp. especially the writings of Augustine) its strength is patent; both bishops and parish priests had to know Punic in those days. We can quite imagine how the Punic population inclined less rapidly to Christianity than the Greco-Latin incomers, and how it remained decidedly retrograde even in the third century, during which period the names of the African bishops are almost entirely Latin. Yet from the very outset the Punic element was never quite absent. Punic names occur, *e.g.*, among the martyrs, and in fact the first African martyr, Namphano, was of Punic birth. On the other hand, no Punic version of the Bible, so far as we know, was ever essayed—implying that the Christianizing of the Punic population meant at the same time their Romanizing.[1]

The Latin Bible originated in Africa probably at an earlier period than in Rome, and Africa formed the motherland of Latin Christian literature. In this sense the country possesses a significance for the history of the world.

The strong military element in the vocabulary of the African church is also one feature which deserves close attention. It can be verified as early as Tertullian, who was a soldier's son. But it is far more

[1] On the Punic element in the African church, see Zahn's *Gesch. des Neutest. Kanons*, i. pp. 40 f. For the benefit of Christians who knew nothing but Punic, the Bible was translated during worship, and there was also preaching in Punic.

surprising to find how prominent it is in the religious dialect of Cyprian, which became authoritative afterwards. Was this element accidental, we may ask? or are we to suppose that relations were established at an early date between Christianity and the military camps in Africa? The very juristic element is not simply to be referred to Tertullian's influence; for it is clear that the ecclesiastical dialect which grew up in Africa was the work of immigrant officials and soldiers, in so far as it was not vernacular.

Between 211 and 249 (Cyprian) we can discover that a large increase in Christianity took place at Carthage and throughout all the African provinces. Then it was that "so many thousands of heretics" ("tot milia hereticorum," Cypr., *epist.* lxxiii. 3) were brought over to the church. Even at the synod of Carthage held under Agrippinus (not later than 218–222 A.D.) to discuss the validity of heretical baptism, there were seventy African and Numidian[1] bishops present,[2] while ninety bishops attended[3] a synod at Lambæsa,[4] presided over by Cyprian's

[1] I do not enter into the question of the political and ecclesiastical divisions of Africa, for which one must refer to the investigations of Mommsen and Schwarze (*Unters. über die äussere Entwickelung der Afrikanischer Kirche*, 1892). There were synods for the separate provinces (though we do not know when these originated), and a general synod. The position of Carthage is quite plain from Cypr., *ep.* xlviii. 3: "Quoniam latius fusa est nostra provincia, habet etiam Numidiam et Mauretaniam sibi cohaerentes" = Since our province has extended more widely, it has also Numidia and Mauretania within its sweep).

[2] Augustine, *de unico bapt. c. Petil.* xiii. (xxii.); cp. Cypr., *ep.* lxxi.

[3] It is not certain whether they were entirely Numidian.

[4] The passage may be read, however, in such a way as to leave the place of meeting an open question. In that case there were deliberations conducted also at Carthage.

(*ep.* lix. 10) predecessor Donatus ("ante multos fere annos," says Cyprian, *i.e.* certainly not later than 240 A.D.). Unfortunately we do not possess any lists of these two synods; but, when one bears in mind the well-known fact that only a certain proportion of bishops attended synods as a rule, the above numbers enable us to infer that a remarkable expansion of the church had occurred by the middle of the third century, although one must never forget that the organization of the church in Northern Africa evidently demanded a bishopric even when there were but a few Christians, *i.e.* in every township. In Africa the episcopal organization was still more thoroughly worked out than in Asia Minor or Lower Italy. Of detached presbyters and deacons we hear not a syllable; even from Cyprian's *ep.* lxii. 5 it is not necessary to infer that such functionaries were in existence.[1]

[1] The episcopal organization in Africa was one result of the municipal organization of Northern Africa which was derived from the Phœnicians. "When the Roman rule began in Africa, the C. territory then consisted in the main of urban communities, for the most part small in size, of which there were counted three hundred, each administered by its suffetes; in this matter the republic did not introduce any change" (Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, v. p. 644; Eng. trans., ii. 329; on the transformation of this organization in Italian towns, see pp. 640 f.; Eng. trans., ii. pp. 332 f.). Among other reasons why the church failed to root itself among the Berbers, we may, perhaps, include this, that these tribes held chiefly to the hills and steppes and lacked any municipal arrangements; they simply formed unions of natives, directly controlled by the suzerainty of the provincial governors. Such conditions rendered any Christianizing process almost out of the question. It was only in certain Celtic provinces, such as Ireland, that the church surmounted this obstacle, and not until she had acquired in monasticism a fresh and more opportune instrument for her propaganda.

From the writings and correspondence of Cyprian we can see quite clearly the size of the Carthaginian church and the graduated order of the local clergy,[1] as well as the diffusion of Christianity throughout the provinces. His treatise *de lapsis* shows that during the previous thirty years the new religion had become naturalized and secularized in the capital as a "religio licita," spreading through all ranks and classes. The victims of the Decian persecution, *i.e.* those who succumbed by renouncing their faith, must have counted by the thousand. But above all, the personality of Cyprian himself shows the importance which already attached to a bishop of Carthage. Read his letters and his martyrdom, and you get the impression that here was a man who enjoyed the repute, and wielded the authority, of a provincial governor ("praeses provinciae"). He is certainly not a whit inferior to Paul of Samosata (see above, pp. 190, 281 f.). We can readily credit his statement (*ep.* lxvi. 5: "novus credentium populus" = a new host of believers) that numerous pagans were won over to Christianity under his episcopal rule. But unfortunately we are ignorant of the circumstances which operated in order to render Christianity in Africa so effective. And such circumstances there must have been. Cyprian's personality, eminent as he was, constituted but a single factor in the Christianizing process.[2]

[1] Though not to the same extent as in Rome. It held true, even within the Christian church, that "Rome must take precedence of Carthage, in virtue of her size" ("pro magnitudine sua debet Carthaginem Roma praecedere," *ep.* lii. 3).

[2] Still the central position in Christendom held by Carthage about the middle of the third century is entirely due to Cyprian,

For statistical purposes Cyprian's writings are of little service. According to *ep.* lxii. 5, he forwarded, along with his letter to some Numidian churches which had been laid waste by brigands, a list of all those members of the Carthaginian church who had contributed the large sum of a hundred thousand sesterces as ransom money [see above, vol. i., pp. 194, 205, 231 f.], but unluckily this list has not been engrossed along with the letter, so that we do not possess it.[1] According to *ep.* lix. 9, he furnished Cornelius of Rome with a list of all the African bishops who had kept aloof from the Novatian schism. But this list also has been lost. No item can be learned from the notices of the African synods which were held before the great synod upon heretical baptism. It is not instructive to be told that an

who corresponded with bishops in Rome, Spain, Gaul, and Cappadocia, and took pains to bring his letters upon the question of apostates "to the notice of all the churches and all the brethren" ("in notitiam ecclesiis omnibus et universis fratribus," *ep.* lv. 5). He governed the churches of Northern Africa from the Syrtes to Mauretania.

[1] Uhlhorn (*die christ. Liebestätigkeit in der alten Kirche,* p. 153; Eng. trans., p. 158) writes thus: "The Carthaginian church cannot as yet [*i.e.* in the days of Cyprian] have been large. Cyprian remarks in passing that he knew every member of it—which proves that at most it amounted to three or four thousand souls." Uhlhorn has *ep.* xli. 4 in view, but we cannot possibly infer from this passage that Cyprian knew all the members of the church. In my opinion, three or four thousand is too low an estimate. The passages upon the persecution, as well as others (including those upon the heretics), give one the impression that Uhlhorn's estimate is put too low, even were one to regard it as equivalent to the number of independent males, in which case it would need to be trebled or quadrupled. Still, Uhlhorn is right in pointing out that, to judge from the letters of Cyprian, the Carthaginian church cannot have numbered its members by tens of thousands.

"ample number of bishops" ("copiosus episcoporum numerus"), *i.e.* 42, 66, 37, 31 (from the proconsular province; 18 Numidian bishops are enumerated), and 71 attended these gatherings. On the other hand, great importance attaches to the protocol which we possess in Cyprian's works upon the synod of 256 or 257 A.D. (on the subject of heretical baptism). Here the votes of 87 bishops are verbally reported, and the sites of their bishoprics are given. At a single stroke we are thus informed of a large number of bishoprics which were in existence previous to 256-257. No doubt, a not inconsiderable proportion of these have not yet been identified, despite the remarkable advances made by investigators of Africa under the Romans. Still the majority can be identified, with the aid of the later councils, the *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* (vol. viii.), and the investigations of Tissot and others (see below). Bishoprics already existed in all parts of Northern Africa (four, *e.g.*, in Tripolitana), the greater number being in the northern proconsular province, and fewest, as one might expect, in Mauretania,[1] while Numidia reveals quite a considerable number.[2] We are justified also in assuming that this great African council was attended by the majority

[1] See the Acts of the martyred Typasius Veteranus (*Anal. Boll.*, 1890, p. 116), which belong to Cicabæ Mauret., and open with these words: "In temporibus Diocletiani et Maximiani imperatorum parva adhuc christianitatis religio fuit" ("In the days of the emperors Diocletian and Maximian, the Christian religion was still a small thing").

[2] Numidia proconsularis and Numidia itself, when put together, seem to have embraced hardly fewer bishoprics than Africa proconsularis (*i.e.* Zeugit. and Byzacium together). As we should expect *a priori*, the majority of the bishoprics which have been identified lie on the main routes.

of the bishops in these provinces who were favourable to Cyprian, unless special circumstances prevented them from putting in an appearance. Those favourable to heretical baptism naturally absented themselves, and we do not know how strong they were.[1] But they were certainly not in the majority. As for the total number of African bishops in the days of Cyprian, we can hardly put that, I should think, above a hundred and fifty.[2]

It is unfortunate that the Christian inscriptions of Africa, which in many respects are so unique and valuable, afford an extremely small amount of reliable material for the pre-Constantine age. As a rule they are almost entirely undated, and consequently almost entirely useless for our present purpose. The numerous inscriptions of the martyrs were almost without exception the work of a later age, and in general they testify, not that a martyr suffered in such and such a place, but that he was reverenced there, or that his relics had been brought thither. To work through the material furnished by the Christian inscriptions of Africa, therefore, yields little or nothing for the third century, although the results are so important for the fourth and fifth and sixth. As for the African Acts and accounts of the martyrs, they present a hard problem. Any tenable results will be found collected at the close of our list of African towns.

[1] Cyprian merely speaks of "episcopi plurimi ex provincia Africa, Numidia, Mauretania," in his introduction.

[2] In the vicinity of Carthage there were a number of towns which sent no bishop to the council, but which nevertheless are not to be considered as having lacked a bishop. We may therefore conjecture that such bishops were opposed to Cyprian on the question of heretical baptism.

Between the reign of Gallienus and the year 303, the church of Africa must have increased by a process of geometrical progression.[1] The fragments of the Donatist Acts, relating to the earliest phase of the schism, almost give us the impression that Christianity had already become the religion of Northern Africa, and this impression is corroborated by an epistle of Constantine (in Eus., *H.E.*, x. 5), in which these "densely populated" provinces appear to be ranked as Christian. Moreover, if one considers (after the *Gesta apud Zenophilum*) the clergy and ecclesiastical treasures of Thamugadi or the clergy of Cirta,[2] the verdict will be that the triumph of the church in Africa was imminent, owing to the internal development of the situation as well as to other causes. The Diocletian persecution only lasted two full years, though it certainly cost the church the loss of many martyrs and apostates (Eusebius himself, in far-off Cæsarea, bears in mind the martyrs in Africa and Mauretania; *H.E.*, x. 5). Once it was over, back flowed the crowd of apostates. And the Donatist movement shows most plainly the extent to which the new religion had permeated the people, and even

[1] Several churches in Cyprian's day were certainly still in extreme poverty, or very insignificant. Why, Cyprian deems it possible, and in fact likely, that the church in one town will be unable to furnish the minimum living wage to support a Christian (a teacher of the dramatic art, who was to abandon his profession)! The town is not named, but its bishop is called Eucratius; and a certain bishop of Thenæ, called Eucratius, occurs among the bishops of the *Sentent. lxxxvii. episcoporum.* So perhaps it is Thenæ which had so poor and small a church.

[2] Basilicas had been erected by this time in towns like Zama and Furni (*Acta Purgat. Felic.* iv.).

the Punic population. People actually began to represent it as a national palladium.

Paganism, quite apart from the Berbers, was not of course extinct even in the fourth century, but the resistance encountered by Christianity seems upon the whole to have been less here than elsewhere. We must look upon any accounts of pagan reactions at Calama and Sufes (Aug., *ep.* xc., xci., l.) as exceptional.

As for the number of bishoprics, almost a hundred can be shown to have existed by 258 A.D., and by the beginning of the fourth century twenty-five more were added. But the places where bishops can be traced were not all the places where bishoprics existed, as is shown by the following consideration. In his work against the Donatists, Optatus happens to mention seventeen towns in which there were bishoprics at the date of the great persecution. Of these seventeen, only eight are noted in Cyprian. The other nine he never mentions. Hence it follows with some probability that the number of bishops in Africa was nearly doubled between 258 and 303 A.D.; while, if one assumes (see above) about 130 or 150 bishoprics in Cyprian's day, one will be disposed to set down about 250 as their number at the opening of the fourth century. This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that in the year 330 no fewer than 270 Donatist bishops were able to assemble. Consequently, if our calculations are correct, the growth of the episcopate in Northern Africa exhibits the following stages: *circa* 220 A.D. (Agrippinus), 70–90 bishoprics; *circa* 250 A.D. nearly 150; by the opening of the fourth century hardly less than

250; and at the beginning of the fifth century about 600.

I now proceed to set down a list of the places where we know Christian churches existed previous to 325 A.D. They are as follows[1]:—

Places mentioned previous to Cyprian[2]:—

Carthage (Tertullian).

Madaura (in Numidia, where — according to Augustine—the first African martyr perished).

Scilium (*Acta Mart. Scil.*, hitherto unidentified, though it must have lain in proconsular Numidia; cp. Neumann's *Röm. Staat und Kirche*, i. p. 71; it is not the same as Cillium in Byzacium).

Uthina (Tert., *de monog.* xii.; in Afric. procons. Zeug.).

Lambæsa (Tert., *ad Scap.* iv. The heretic Privatus lived here not later than *circa* 240 A.D.; in Numidia).

Hadrumetum (Tert., *ad Scap.* iii.; in Afric. procons. Byz.).

Thysdrus (Tert., *ad Scap.* iv.; in Afric. procons. Byz.).

Tipasa (in Mauret. Cæs.; a dated Christian inscription of the year 238 in *CIL* viii., No. 9289, Suppl. 20,856. But its Christian character is not absolutely certain).

There were Christians in Tertullian's day in Mauretania; cp. *ad Scap.* iv.: "Nam et nunc a praeside Mauretaniae vexatur hoc nomen" (see above, p. 414).

[1] I am sorry to have been unable to examine Toulotte's work, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1892 f.).

[2] In marking the provinces in which the various towns lie, I have followed the map in *CIL*, vol. viii.

Places mentioned by Cyprian[1]:—

Abbir Germaniciana (identification uncertain; cp. Wilmanns in *CIL*, viii. p. 102, and Tissot's *Géogr. de la province Romaine l'Afrique*, ii. pp. 593, 771. Wilmanns identifies Abbir Cellense in Africa, procons. Zeug., with Abbir maius, and our Abbir with Abbir minus, which is also to be sought in Procons. Zeug.).

Abitini (unidentified; must have lain near Membressa in Afric. procons. Zeug.; local martyrs, cp. vol. i. pp. 456, 492, and Ruinart's *Acta Mart.*, pp. 414 f.).

[1] The classification of the eighty-seven bishops at the council of Carthage is not according to their provinces, so that in cases where the seat of the bishopric has hitherto eluded identification, one cannot unfortunately determine from the order the precise province in which we are to look for it. Some help, however, is afforded by the lists of later Carthaginian councils, when the bishoprics are assigned to their provinces. A curious position at the former council was occupied by the bishopric of Tripolitana, which was represented by two members, one of whom voted also in the name of two absent bishops of Tripolitana. (It is remarkable, by the way, that Neapolis, along with Leptis magna, had a bishop of its own, and that the bishop of the latter place was represented by the bishop of Oea and not of Neapolis. Probably the former was an older man. Perhaps, too, by Neapolis we are meant to understand, not the Tripolitan town, but Neapolis in provincia Zeugitana, although it is mentioned after Oea.) These Tripolitan Christians voted (Nos. 83–86) at the conclusion of the division, apologizing by themselves for the non-appearance of their two colleagues, and then voting in their stead. As the opening of the protocol mentions Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania, without a word of Tripolitana, we may perhaps assume that the Tripolitan bishops were not at that time regular members of the general African synod, but held a kind of independent position, though they received on this occasion a special invitation to be present (which would also explain the unusual act of taking their votes *in absentia*). As the other bishops did not vote according to their provinces—

Aggya (= Acbia, = Agbia in Afric. procons. Zeug.; Tissot, ii. pp. 339, 341, 450).[1]

Ammedera (= Ad Medera, in Afric. procons. Byz.; Tissot, ii. pp. 459 f. 816).

Assuras (Numid. procons.; Tissot, ii. pp. 568, 619, 818).

Ausafa (probably = Uzappa; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 575, 586, 600, 791; in Afric. procons. Byz., not far from the S.E. corner of Num. procons.).

Ausuaga (= Auzuaga; there were two places of this name in Africa procons., but neither, to my knowledge, has been identified; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 772).

Bagai (in Numid.; see Tissot, ii. p. 817).

Bamacorra (in Numid.; unidentified; called after the patronymic of Bamacures, Pliny, v. 4; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 777).

Biltha (unidentified; its bishop was the first speaker at Cyprian's great council. According to the list of the council of 411, we are to look for this place in Africa procons.).

Bulla (may be identified with Bulla Regia in

a proof that the ecclesiastical division of the African provinces was still very imperfect—it is obvious that they must have voted in order of seniority; and this conjecture is corroborated (1) by the well-known fact that in Numidia the oldest bishop always discharged the duties of the metropolitan; and (2) by the remark that the bishop (of Cuicul) who voted as No. 71 emphasized the "recent origin" ("novitas") of his episcopate ("Novitas episcopatus effecit, ut sustinerem quid maiores indicarent"), as did the seventy-eighth bishop ("quod et ipsi scitis, non olim sum episcopus constitutus"). A comparison of the names of the bishops at the earlier councils shows, however, that this principle of seniority cannot have been strictly adhered to in every case.

[1] Others identify Aggya with Oppidum Aggense, not with Agbia.

Numid. procons., but there seems also to have been a Bulla in Afric. procons.).

Buslacena (= Bisica Lucana in Afric. procons. Zeug.? Hardly. The place is unknown).

Buruc (Burug; unknown. In procons.).

Capsa (= Gafsa in Afric. procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 663, 783. But there seems also to have been a Capsa in Numidia; see Tissot, p. 777).

Carpi (Africa procons. Zeug.).

Castra Galbæ (unidentified; in Numid.).

Cedia (in Numid.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 817).

Chullabi (unknown).

Cibaliana (unknown; procons.).

Cirta (in Numidia; the existence of several basilicas previous to the great persecution is proved by Optatus i. 14. Native-place of Cæcilius Natalis, the disputant in the *Octavius* of Minutius Felix: see also *CIL* viii., Nos. 7094–7098, and Dessau in *Hermes*, 1880, part 3).

Cuicul (in Numidia, on the borders of Mauretania; Tissot, ii. pp. 27, 409, 806, 815).

Curubis (Africa procons. Zeug.).

Diana (so Cypr., *ep.* xxxiv. 1, according to codex *Z*: "Gaio Dianensi"; other MSS. "Gaio Didensi." Perhaps Diana Veteranorum in Numidia; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 484, 508, 817).

Dionysiana (Africa procons. Byz.; unidentified).

Furni (Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. xvi., 322, 580).

Gazaufala (= Gadiaufala, in Numidia; see Tissot, ii. pp. 385, 418).

Gemellæ (it is hardly the Mlili in the extreme S.E. of Numidia that is meant, but the Mauretanian

Gemellæ S.E. of Sitifis; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 28, 30, 507–509, 523, 807. A third Gemellæ lay near Capua in Byzac.).

Germaniciana (Africa procons. Byz., between Aquæ Regiæ and Thysdrus; Tissot, ii. p. 589).

Girba (also Girha and Gibar in MSS.; unidentified. The island Girba in Tripolitana?)

Gorduba (MSS. al.: Gor, in Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. 555, 595).

Gurgites (Africa procons. Byz.; unidentified).

Henschir Tambra: where Christian inscriptions have been discovered, dating from the third century (see *Akad. d. Inscr. et Belles Lettres, Compte Rendu*, 1904, pp. 186 f.).

Hippo Regius (Numid. procons.).

Hippo Diarrhytus (Africa procons. Zeug.).

Horrea Cælia (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 145, 809).

Lamasba (Numidia).

Lares (Num. procons.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 454, 816).

Leptis magna (Tripol.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 31, 219, 812).

Leptis minus (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 49, 168, 171, 728, 810).

Luperciana (unknown).

Macomades (Numid.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 477; but perhaps M. minores on the coast of Africa is meant, procons. Byz.; we are not to think of M. Syrtis).

Mactaris (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 586, 620, 819).

Marazana (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 629).

Marcelliana (unknown).

Mascula (Numid.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 480 f., 505, 817).

Membressa (Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 325, 774, 812).

Midila (or Madili, Medila. In the fifth century there was a Numidian bishopric of Midili, but here we are perhaps to think of the pagus Mercurialis Veteranorum Medelitanorum lying not far from the modern Tunis; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 591).

Milev (in Numidia).

Misgirpa (or Miscirpa, Migiripa, Migirpa, in procons.; unknown).

Muguæ near Cirta in Numidia (known through the *Mart. Mariani et Jacobi*).

Muzula (unknown; in procons.).

Neapolis (Tripolit.; cp. Barth, in Tissot, ii. p. 220. Though Neapolis was but a division of Leptis magna, it had a bishop of its own. Otherwise we must understand by it in this connection the town of Neapolis in Africa procons. Zeug., despite the fact that Neapolis here stands immediately after Oea; cp. above, p. 425, and Tissot, ii. pp. 133 f.).

Nova (Nova Petra, not far from Diana in Numidia? Tissot, ii. p. 509. Or Nova Sparsa at Gemellæ? Or some unknown spot?).

Obba (or Bobba; is usually looked for in Mauretania, but it lies not far from Lares in Numid. procons.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 459).

Octavum (Num. or Byz.; unidentified).

Oea (Tripol.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 217, 812).

Rucuma (Africa procons. unidentified).

Rusicade (Numid.; Tissot, ii. pp. 103, 808).

Sabrata (Tripol.; Tissot, ii. pp. 209, 211).

Segermes (= Henchir Harat in Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 558).

Sicca (= Sicca Veneria in Num. procons.; Tissot, ii. pp. 7, 21, 375, 815).

Sicilibba (Africa procons. Zeug.; Tissot, ii. pp. xvi., 318, 437, 564).

Sigus (a mine near this town S.E. of Cirta; Cypr., *ep.* lxxix.; Tissot, ii. p. 424).

Sufes (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 617).

Sufetula (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 613, 819).

Sutunurum (MSS., Sutunurcensis, Suturnucensis, Quoturnicensis, Uturnucensis, perhaps Suburburensium gens, between Cirta and Sitifis, in Numidia; cp. *CIL* viii., Nos. 10,335 and 8270).

Thabraca (seaport on the African coast of Num. procons.; Tissot, ii. pp. 94, 808).

Thambi (unidentified).

Thamogade (= Thamugadi in Numidia; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 30, 487, 817).

Tharasa (in Numidia; unidentified).

Thasualthê (or Thasuathê, perhaps the same as Thasartê in the southern part of Byz., on the borders of Tripolitana; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 656).

Thelebtê (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 49, 648 f., 676, 783).

Thenæ (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 2, 16, 190, 811).

Thevestê (in Numidia; see also Optatus, ii. 18).

Thibaris (Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 367).

Thimida Regia (Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 590).

Thinisa (probably Thunisa; Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 86).

Thubunæ (in extreme S.W. of Numidia; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 719).

Thuburbo (either Th. minus in Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 247, 812; or Th. maius in the southern district of the same province; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 545. Augustine knew of martyrs in this town, who are included with Perpetua and Felicitas by the inferior class of MSS. of the *Acta Perpet. et Felic.*).

Thucca (= Thugga; Africa procons. Zeug.).

Tucca (seaport on the borders of Numidia and Mauretania; Tissot, ii. pp. 411 f.; or = Tucca Terebenthina in the north of Byzac.; Tissot, ii. p. 619).

Thuccabor (Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 291, 812).

Vadæ? Badæ? Badis? Cod. T: = Abbadis (in Numidia; unidentified; perhaps Ad Badias between Bescera and Ad Maiores in southmost Numidia).

Vaga (in Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 6, 302, 813).

Victoriana (in Numidia; unidentified).

Vicus Cæsaris (unknown, perhaps in Numidia; hardly = Vicus Augusti south of Vaga in Africa procons. Zeug.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 257, 607, 770).

Ululis (unknown; are we to substitute for it Uzelis in Numidia or Uzalis in Utica?).

Utica (Africa procons. Zeug.).

Zama (Zama regia in Numidia procons.; cp. Tissot,

ii. pp. 7, 571, 577 f., 586. We are hardly to think here of Zama minor [Colonia Zama]).[1]

Places mentioned after Cyprian, down to the council of Nicæa:—

Aptungi (Autumni; unidentified hitherto, perhaps in Numid. procons.; *Acta Donat.*).

Aquæ Tibilitanæ (in Numid., on the borders of Numid. procons., *Acta Donat.*; cp. Tissot, ii. p. 384).

Calama (Centurionensis, *Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; unidentified).

Centurionis (Centurionensis, *Acta Donat.*; in Numidia, unidentified).

Garbe (*Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; unidentified).

Limata (*Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; unidentified).

Rotarium (*Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; unidentified).

Casæ Nigræ (*Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; unidentified).

Tigisis Numid. (*Acta Donat.*; in Numidia; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 420, 816).

Cæsarea Mauret. (synod of Arles; ancient martyrs; cp. *CIL* viii., No. 9585).

Legisvolumen (in Numid., unknown; synod of Arles).

Pocofeltæ (synod of Arles; it is uncertain whether we are to look for this town in North Africa at all).

Verum (synod of Arles; it is uncertain whether we are to look for this town in North Africa at all).

[1] The father of Novatus died in a village ("vicus"; cp. Cypr., *ep.* lii. 3) which is not named.—We must look in Mauretania for the bishop of an "incerti loci," to whom Cyprian's seventy-first epistle is addressed (cp. *ep.* lxxii. 1); perhaps, too, for bishop Jubajan (*ep.* lxxiii.), who occupied a see at a great distance from Carthage.

Alatina (or Alutina; unknown; a number of MSS. [*Mart. Saturnini et Dativi*] write Abitini, a city mentioned also by Cyprian; cp. above, p. 425).

Ambiensis (in one MS. the martyr Maximus is described as having been martyred in the province of Ambiensis [Ruinart, p. 202]; according to the *Notitia eccl. Africanæ* there was a bishop of A. in Mauretania. The place is unknown).

Bolitana civitas (local martyrs, according to Augustine; the place is unknown; perhaps = Ballis [Vallis]; cp. Optatus, ii. 4).

Bubiduna? (Novidunum? Nividunum? unknown. Local martyrs, according to the *Martyrol. Syriacum*).

Cartenna (Mauret.; local martyrs; cp. Schwartze, *Unters. über die Entwicklung der afrikanischen Kirche*, 1892, pp. 109 f.).

Cherchel (Mauret.; numerous inscriptions, which are probably to be transferred to the third century).

Cicabis (Ticabis; in Maur. Sitif.; unidentified; Mart.; cp. Schwartze, p. 147).

Maxula (Africa procons. Byz.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 111, 719; local martyrs, according to Augustine).

Sitifis (Mauret.; martyrs; cp. Schwartze, pp. 145 f.).

Thagastê (Numid. procons.; August., *de mendacio* xiii.).

Thagura = Thagara (Numid. procons.; cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 382, 814; St Crispina was born here).

Thibiuca (so we may read, instead of Thibiura; we are not to think of Thibursicum Burê; in Africa procons. Byz; *Mart. Felicis;* cp. Tissot, ii. pp. 287 f.).

Tingi (Mauret., *Acta Marcelli*).

Tizica (Augustine observes that the bishop of this

town, Novellus, was condemned by the Donatists in 313 A.D.).

Uzalis (near Utica, or Uzelis in Numidia; *Mart. Felicis et Gennadii*).

Orléansville (near this town ruins of a basilica have been discovered, which was built in 324 A.D., according to an inscription in *CIL* viii., 9708).

In the vicinity of Sousse a catacomb, with third century inscriptions, has been discovered; see "Akad. d. Inscr. et Belles Lettres," *Compte Rendu*, 1904, pp. 637 f.

Cephalitana possessio (near Thuburbo minus or maius; unknown; in Africa procons. Zeug.; *Mart. Maximæ et Secundæ*, etc.).[1]

Setting aside places which cannot be identified at all in connection with the province, as well as places which are doubtful on account of the similarity of their names or for other reasons, the remainder group themselves thus: to Africa proconsularis and to Numidia falls the majority of the bishoprics; Tripolitana and Mauretania have but a few. With map in hand we notice the equable distribution of Christianity over the various provinces (with the exception of Mauretania), equable, *i.e.*, when we take into account the nature of the soil and the presumed density of

[1] There is a dated (322 A.D.) Christian inscription in Satafis = Aïn Kebira in Mauretania Sitif. (cp. *CIL* viii., Suppl. III. No. 20,305, the sheets of which were furnished me by the courtesy of Herr Dessau). Should we not also regard as Christian the inscription from Auzia in Mauretania Cæs. (*loc. cit.*, No. 20,780), dated 318 A.D., with the formula D·M·S·, rendered as "donis memoriae spiritantium"? For Tipasa and its female martyr Salsa, see *loc. cit.*, Nos. 20,914 and 20,903.—Of all the ruins of churches and basilicas discovered in the African provinces, not one can be traced back, so far as I know, to the third century with any probability, not even the church of Henchir-el-Atech (= Ad Portum).

the population.[1] The only parallel to this diffusion occurs in some of the provinces in Asia Minor. Even before Constantine the Christianizing of the country had proved itself a penetrating influence. But though it penetrated far, it did not last. Rapidly as Christianity struck down its roots into the soil of Africa and spread itself abroad, it was as rapidly swept away by Islam. The native Berber population was but superficially Christianized, so far as it was Christianized at all. The next stratum, that of the Punic inhabitants, appears to have been Christianized for the most part; but as the Punic language never got possession of the Bible or of any ecclesiastical dialect, the Christianizing process was not permanent. The third stratum, that of the Greco-Roman population, became in all likelihood entirely Christian by slow degrees. But it was too thin. Individual churches did manage to maintain themselves till far on in the Middle Ages, but they were quite sparse, and the Christians showed less tenacity in this quarter than their far less numerous neighbours the Jews.

§ 19. Spain.

"Here, also, the republic had from the very first contemplated the conquest of the whole peninsula." "If any preliminary steps had been taken by the republic which facilitated the Romanizing of the West—that movement of world-wide significance

[1] Only we must observe that Carthage retained the same importance for the Christianizing of Africa as for the Romanizing of the province. Churches were most numerous in the vicinity, near and far, of the metropolis.

which belonged to the subsequent imperial age,—these steps were taken in Spain." "In no other province, during the imperial age, was the Romanizing process so keenly urged by the authorities as in Spain." "When Augustus died, the Roman language and Roman customs predominated in Andalusia, Granada, Murcia, Valencia, Catalonia, and Arragon; and a large proportion of these results is to be attributed to a Romanizing, and not to a colonizing, process." "Monuments with native inscriptions, dating from the imperial age, can hardly be found in Spain." "No other province exhibits a Romanizing process of equal strength in matters of ritual." "Historically, the outstanding feature of importance in the Latin authors of Spain is the undeviating adherence of these provincials to the literary development which marked the mother-country. The Gallic rhetoricians and the great authors of the African church remained to some extent foreign, even as they wrote in Latin; but no one would judge, from their style and substance, that a Seneca or a Martial was a foreigner." "Under Augustus, Tarraco was the headquarters of the Government." "The headquarters of the Spanish troops lay between Lancia, the ancient metropolis of Asturia, and the new Asturica Augusta (Astorga) in Leon, which still bears his name." "Although elsewhere throughout the senatorial provinces it was unusual for imperial troops to be stationed, Italica (near Seville) formed an exception to the rule. It had a division of the Leon legion." "We find . . . . Emerita (Merida), a colony of veterans founded by Augustus during his stay in Spain and elevated to

be the capital of Lusitania. In the provincia Tarraconensis the burgess-towns are mainly on the coast; only one appears in the interior, viz., that of Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa)."

The data known to us from the earliest history of the churches in Spain[1] harmonize remarkably with these sentences from Mommsen's *Röm. Geschichte* (v. pp. 57 f.; Eng. trans., i. 63 f.). For us, this history commences—apart from the notices in Irenæus (i. 10) and Tertullian (*adv. Jud.* vii., "Hispaniorum omnes termini"), which prove the existence of Christians in Spain—with the letter (*ep.* lxvii.) in which Cyprian replies to a Spanish communication. This letter shows that there were Christian communities in Leon, Astorga, Merida, and Saragossa, *i.e. in the very spots where we would look for the earliest settlements.* We learn also that the Spanish Christian communities were already numerous, that their bishops formed a united synod, and that several of the bishops were more secular than was the case elsewhere, whilst the sharp lines of demarcation between Christianity and the Roman cultus threatened to become obliterated (ch. 6).[2] Finally, we learn that the

[1] Gams's work, *die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* (Bd. I. u. II., 1862, 1864), is extremely painstaking but uncritical, though the author is not so destitute of the critical faculty as several of his Spanish predecessors.

[2] "Quapropter cum, sicut scribitis, fratres dilectissimi, et ut Felix et Sabinus collegae nostri [Spanish bishops, who had arrived at Carthage] adseverant utque alius Felix de Caesaraugusta fidei cultor ac defensor veritatis litteris suis significat, Basilides et Martialis [the accused bishops] nefando idololatriae libello contaminati sint, Basilides adhuc insuper praeter libelli maculam [the Decian persecution] cum infirmitate decumberet, in deum blasphemaverit et se blasphemmasse confessus sit et episcopatum

earliest extant appeal of a foreign bishop to the bishop of Rome was one outcome of this crisis (ch. 5). Even in Spain people were Roman.[1] If we examine further the chaos of Spanish legends relating to the martyrs, we can safely say that Tarragona, Seville, Cordova, Calahorra, Complutum, and Saragossa were towns where Christian communities existed, while martyrdoms, and consequently Christian communities, may

pro conscientiae suae vulnere sponte deponens ad agendam paenitentiam conversus sit deum deprecans et satis gratulans si sibi vel laico communicare contingeret, Martialis quoque *praeter gentilium turpia et lutulenta convivia in collegio diu frequentata et filios in eodem collegio exterarum gentium more apud profana sepulcra depositos et alienigenis consepultos, actis etiam publice habitis apud procuratorem ducenarium obtemperasse se idololatriae et Christum negasse contestatus sit* cumque alia multa sint et gravia delicta quibus Basilides et Martialis implicati tenentur," etc. ("Wherefore, as you have written, dearly beloved brethren, and as our colleagues Felix and Sabinus maintain, and as another Felix of Cæsaraugusta, who upholds the faith and defends the truth, has shown in his letter, Basilides and Martialis have been contaminated by the accursed certificate of idolatry; while Basilides, in addition to the stain of the certificate, blasphemed God when he was prostrated by sickness, and confessed that he had blasphemed; and then, owing to his wounded conscience, gave up his episcopate of his own accord, betaking himself to repentance and supplicating God, thankful even to be permitted to communicate as a layman. Martialis, too, *besides his long-continued attendance at the shameful and lewd feasts of the pagans in their halls, besides placing his sons there, in foreign fashion, among profane tombs and burying them beside strangers, has also admitted, in depositions before the ducenarian procurator, that he gave way to idolatry and denied Christ.* Inasmuch, too, as there are many other grave crimes in which Basilides and Martialis are held to be implicated," etc.).

[1] It was in opposition to this appeal that the Spanish bishops turned first of all to the African synod.—The history of the church in Africa in other respects, however, stands entirely apart from that of the Spanish church. The Donatist movement did not pass beyond the Straits of Gibraltar; in fact, it barely reached Mauretania Tingitana.

be probably assigned also to Italica, Barcelona, and Gerunda (= Gerona). *A priori* we should conjecture this in the majority of these towns.[1]

These scanty notices would exhaust our knowledge of the Spanish church's history previous to Constantine. No famous bishop, not a single Christian author, is visible; no trace whatever of independent life[2] is to be found, had we not the good fortune to possess the Acts and signatures of a Spanish synod, previous to Constantine, viz., the synod of Elvira.[3]

From these signatures (the names of course being Latin) we learn that all the Spanish provinces (excepting Mauretania Tingitana, however) were represented at the synod.

Gallicia: Leon (Legio).

Tarracon.: Saragossa (Tarragona being awanting).

Lusitan.: Merida, Ossonova (Faro), Evora.

Carthag.: Carthagena, Acci (Guadix), Castulo [Cazlona], Mentesa, Urci, Toledo, Salavia, Lorca, Basti.

Bætica: Cordova,[4] Seville, Tucci [Martos], Ipa-

[1] We must compare with some of the Acts of the martyrs, especially Prudentius *περὶ στεφάνων*. The martyrdom of bishop Fructuosus of Tarragona (whose Acts I hold to be authentic) falls in the reign of Valerius.

[2] One trace perhaps may be detected in Priscillian, at the close of the fourth century.

[3] See Hefele, *Konziliengesch.*, I.(2) pp. 148 f. [Eng. trans., i. p. 131 f.]; Dale, *The Synod of Elvira* (1882); and Duchesne, *le concile d'Elvire et les flamines chrétiens* (1886). Duchesne has shown it to be likely that the synod took place not long before 303 A.D.

[4] The episcopal seat of Hosius, the well-known court-bishop and "minister of religious affairs" under Constantine.

grum (Epagro), Illiberis (Granada), Malaga, Ilipula, Ursona, Illiturgi, Carula, Astigi, Ategua, Acinipo, Singilia-Barba, Igabrum, Ulia, Selambina, Gemella, Ossigi.

To these fall to be added six further names in the list, all of which Gams has endeavoured to identify, but which have perished in the course of tradition.[1] It is not surprising that, with a council held in Bætica, almost two-thirds of the bishops (or clergy) should be looked for in that province. But one may conjecture that Bætica was also the province in which the Christian population was most dense. At any rate, from those who took part in the council, it is plain that Christianity was diffused in all parts of the country about the year 300, as might well be expected in the case of a province which had been so thoroughly Romanized. The mere fact of twenty-five Bætican churches and fourteen other churches being represented at Elvira involves the existence

[1] Gams enumerates in Bætica :—Cordova, Seville, Tucci (Martos), Ipagrum (Epagro), Illiberis (Granada), Malaga, Ursona (Ossuna), Carula, Astigi, Acinippo, Ossigi, Cabra, Calagurris-Fibularia, Montoro, Andujar, Teva, Lorca, Laurum, Barbe, Ajune, Municipium (?), Montemayor, Drona (?), Vera, S. Lucar la Mayor. The signatures in the MSS. (leaving out the names of the bishops and clergy) run as follows :—Episcopus Accitanus, Cordubensis, Spalensis, Tuccitanus, Epagrensis [Bigerrensis], Castulonensis [Catraleucensis], Mentesanus, Eliberitanus, Urcitanus [Corsicanus], Emeritanus, Cæsaraugustanus, Legionensis, Toletanus, de Salaria [Siblaria, Sibariensis], Ossonobensis, Elborensis, de Eliocrota, Bastitanus [Bassitanus], Malacitanus. Presbyter de Elepel, Orsuna, Illiturgi, Carula, Advingi, Ateva, Accinipi, Eliocrota, Lauro, Barbæ, a Gabro, a Vinc [?], a Municipio, Ulia, Sagalbina, Urci, Gemella, Castellona, Drona, Barca, Solia, Ossigi, Carthagine, Corduba. Any locality omitted above either rests upon an uncertain text or is no longer to be identified.

of a considerable number of churches throughout the country.[1]

The earliest source available for the history of the Spanish church points to a serious process of secularizing, and the eighty-one canons of this synod amply corroborate this truth. At the same time they exhibit in a striking fashion that contrast between coarse worldliness and fanatical strictness which has characterized the history of the Spanish church in every age. The dreadful state of matters which Sulpicius Severus has unbared in the Spanish church of his own day, here throws its shadow across the earlier history.

The worldliness of the Spanish church and the danger which it incurred of making terms with pagan rites, may be seen from the remarkable fact that local Christians discharged the office of flamen and other pagan priestly offices (whose religious character had faded), besides the duumvirate (cp. canons ii., iv., lv., lvi.), as well as from the misdeeds perpetrated by Christians themselves—such as Christian mistresses who whip their handmaids to death (canon v.), Christian murderers, "qui maleficio interficiunt" (vi.), the coarsest forms of lechery, adultery, and laxity in marriage (vii.-x., xxx., xxxi., xlvi., lxiii., lxiv., lxvi.–lxxii.), Christian pimps and procuresses (xii.), adulterous consecrated virgins (xiii.), parents who marry their daughters to pagan priests (xvii.), whorish and adulterous bishops and clergy (xviii.), adulteresses among the wives of the clergy (lxv.),

[1] The Spanish churches had not all bishops; several were governed indeed by a single deacon. Cp. the 77th canon of Elvira.

clergy who trade and frequent fairs (xix.), clerical usurers (xx.), and so forth. Further proof of secularization is afforded by the prohibition of lighted candles by day in cemeteries, "lest the spirits of the saintly dead be disquieted" (xxxiv.), and of women spending the night there, "since they often make prayer the pretext for secretly committing sin" ("eo quod saepe sub obtentu orationis latenter scelera commitunt" xxxv.). The prohibition which forbids any paintings in the churches may reflect on gorgeous basilicas and pagan abuse of pictures (xxxvi.: "Ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur," where one expects "ne quod in parietibus depingitur colatur et adoretur"). Lampoons were already affixed to churches (lii.). And a secularizing tendency is implied even in the provision of canon xxxix., that "if pagans in their sickness wish hands to be laid on them, and if their life has been at all respectable, it is resolved that they shall receive the imposition of hands and be made Christians" ("Gentiles si in infirmitate desideraverint sibi manum imponi, si fuerit eorum ex aliqua parte honesta vita, placuit eis manum imponi et fieri Christianos"); for this implies that Christianity has been adopted as a "viaticum mortis." The fortieth canon presupposes a class of Christians who are great landed proprietors, and who permit their tenants to deduct from their rent monies laid out in honour of the god of agriculture. The forty-first canon presupposes people who let their slaves retain their idols, while canon xlix. relates to those who have their fields blessed by Jews. Tardiness or utter neglect of church attendance (xxi., xlvi.); catechumens, who for a long while ("per infinita tempora,"

xlv.)[1] never came near the church; Christians who lent their clothes to deck out secular pageants ("qui vestimenta sua ad ornandam saeculariter pompam dant," lvii.); Christians who go up to the capital, like very pagans, to sacrifice to the idol and to look on ("qui ut gentiles ad idolum Capitolii causa sacrificandi ascendunt et vident," lix.); gamesters (lxxix.), etc.—these are other features of the situation.

These samples must suffice to indicate the extent to which Spanish Christianity had become domiciled in the world, and also diffused before the days of Constantine. But one other canon is of especial significance in this connection, the canon (lx.) which declares that no one is to be counted a martyr who has demolished images and perished for this offence. Here and there throughout Spain, Christians must therefore have attacked the pagan cultus by force, a fact which implies a wide diffusion of the faith. One further proof of this may be noted in the application of the name "faithful" ("fideles") even to heretics—which, so far as I know, was confined to Spain. It was applied thus by the very orthodox themselves (canon li.), so that the term "fidelis" must have lost much of its pristine force. Heretics, moreover, must have become very plentiful already in Spain, and the church must have been imperilled thereby, as is shown by the decision of canon xvi.,[2] which condemns

[1] It is evident from this canon, moreover, that no lists of catechumens were kept any longer, owing to their large numbers and their loose connection with the church. Yet they were held to be already Christians (cp. canon xxxix.).

[2] In canon xv. we read: "Propter copiam puellarum gentilibus minime in matrimonium dandae sunt virgines Christianae, ne aetas in flore tumens in adulterium animae resolvatur" [see above, p. 237].

intermarriage with heretics more severely than intermarriage with heathens. The Jews, too, were a danger to the Spanish Christians, and a number of canons show that a certain Judaizing tendency threatened the local Christians.—It is needless to bring forward separate canons to prove the rigour of the punishments threatened for these various offences.

The history of the Spanish church, whose characteristics are so vividly brought out by these synodal canons, is totally unknown to us, as far as its origins are concerned. The canons present it as already an "old" church. In the "Roman" territory, to which even the apostle Paul (according to Clemens Romanus and the Muratorian Fragment) made his way, the church may have arisen almost as early as in Rome itself, but for a long time to come it did nothing to bring itself into notice, and upon its entrance eventually into the daylight of history no glorious things were spoken of it. The rigorous discipline decreed by the synod of Elvira over the churches may appear impressive to many people, but we are quite ignorant of its results, or rather, we are not ignorant that by the close of the fourth century the Spanish church was in a very bad way. No country offered such resistance as did Spain and her clergy to that monastic asceticism which formed the contemporary expression of all that was most earnest in Christianity.

But no punishment is threatened as in the case of marriages with heretics and Jews. It is noticeable that the female sex in Spain also appears to have taken a keener interest in Christianity than did the men.

We have now concluded our survey of the spread of Christianity in the Roman provinces. To render it complete, one would require to add a conspectus of the non-Catholic churches and their spread, but our knowledge of this department is too slight. All that can be said is that the more significant schisms and heresies (apart from Donatism) gained entrance to the churches in every quarter; we meet with them in Gaul and in North Africa as well as in Egypt and Syria.[1] As to their strength and organization, of course, we can hardly put forward any surmises. Three large movements did assume forms which were truly œcumenical: Marcionitism, Montanism (between 180 and 230; then it ceased to be œcumenical), and Novatianism. In point of catholicity, they were not inferior to the Catholic church, but we are unable to form any numerical estimate of their respective strength.[2]

[1] With the majority of these heresies and sects the energy of propaganda was very keen; which serves to establish, on their part, the zeal of Christians in general for propagandism. By 150 A.D. Marcion's movement, according to Justin (*Apol.*, I. xxvi.), was diffused everywhere throughout the empire (ὃς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων συλλήψεως πολλοὺς πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν, "who, by aid of demons, has caused many in every race of men to utter blasphemies"). By about 180 A.D., *i.e.* fifty years after its origin, the Valentinian heresy with the adherents of Marcus had also permeated the churches of the East and the West alike. The Montanist movement, which may have left its native soil about 170 A.D., had penetrated in all directions during the course of twenty years more. As has been observed above (vol. i. pp. 462 f.), the teachers and founders of the sects always betook themselves to Rome, in order to push their cause.

[2] By the end of the fourth century the primitive sects had already died out in the West, or passed over into Manichæism, as we learn from Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and Optatus (i. 9;

"Haereticorum per provincias Africanas non solum vitia sed etiam nomina videbantur ignota—Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, et ceteri, usque, ad Cataphrygas" = Throughout the African provinces people seemed ignorant of the very names, no less than of the vices, of heretics like Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, and the rest, even down to the Cataphrygians). But it was otherwise in the East. Theodoret (*ep.* lxxxi.) tells how he converted *eight* villages and their surroundings (καὶ τὰς πέριξ κειμένας) from Marcionitism (note that the Marcionites were "pagans," and had grouped themselves at the same time in villages). In *ep.* cxiii. the same bishop says that he had converted more than a thousand Marcionites, and similar facts are known with regard to Chrysostom and Nestorius. Theodoret's boast, that he had suppressed over 260 copies of Tatian's "Diatesseron" in his diocese (*Hær. fab.*, I. xx.) is of no weight whatever. The book had hitherto been the gospel-book of quite orthodox Christian communities.

APPENDIX.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE SPREAD OF MITHRAISM.

THANKS to Cumont's fine work, *Les Mystères de Mithra* (1900, with a map illustrating the diffusion of the cult throughout the Roman empire),[2] we now know the history of Mithraism and the extent of its diffusion. It is instructive to compare its spread with that of Christianity, for (i.) both religions were Oriental; (ii.) both entered the Roman empire about the same time, to run a parallel course; (iii.) both were propagated at first among the lower classes; and (iv.) both agreed in several important features. A glance at Cumont's map, however, reveals at once the sharpest difference between the two religions; in fact, it points to the real reason why the cult of Mithra could not gain the day, and why its religion had to continue weak, despite the wide extent of its diffusion. For *the entire domain of Hellenism was closed to it*, and consequently Hellenism itself. Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Bithynia, Asia, the central provinces of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt—none of

[2] Eng. ed. and trans. by T. J. M'Cormack (1903; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.).

these ever had any craving for the cult of Mithra. And these were the civilized countries κατ' ἐξοχήν. They were closed to Mithra, and as he thus failed to get into touch at all with Hellenism, his cult was condemned to the position of a barbarous sect. Now these were the very regions in which Christianity found an immediate and open entrance, the result being that the latter religion came at once into a vital contact with Hellenism, which led before long to a fusion of the two. Place a map of the spread of Mithraism (in the East) side by side with a map of the spread of Christianity, and you will observe that what is marked white in the one is black in the other, and *vice versa*. From this historians at once see that the former had to perish, and the latter to survive. Throughout the regions lying between the south coast of the Adriatic and Taurus, between Pontus and the cataracts of the Nile, there was never any conflict at all between Mithraism and Christianity. Nowhere within these bounds, apart from a few towns upon the coast, did anyone know anything of Mithra.

It was otherwise in the West. There Mithraism is not visible till after the close of the first century, and even during the second century its diffusion is still limited. But after the reign of Commodus it increases at a rapid rate, occupying province after province. From Cumont's map we can plainly observe that soldiers were the real supporters or missionaries of the cult. Adherents of Mithra are most numerous in Dacia, Mœsia, Noricum, Rhætia, and Germany, always on the boundaries of these provinces—and even in Britain. Next to the soldiers,

it was Syrian traders, and especially Oriental slaves (as we learn from the ancient inscriptions), who spread the cult. But a diffusion of this kind counts for very little, and, as a matter of fact, while Mithraism permeated almost all the Western empire, it was of no importance as a universal religion until about 180 A.D. This change occurred when it came to be recognized at Rome that the imperial cultus and Mithraism were calculated to afford each other mutual support, as Cumont has clearly brought out in pp. 33–41 of his monograph (the section entitled "Mithra et le pouvoir impérial"), pp. 13–32 having been already devoted to a survey of the spread of the religion. The cult of Mithra now passed out beyond the soldier's tents and the settlements of the veterans, to reach the officers of the army and to penetrate the world where people were socially connected with officers of high rank and with the emperor. And it vivified the imperial cultus as it went (this cultus of the holy, the blessed, the invincible, the eternal One, the sun-king). In the third century Rome was simply the headquarters of the Mithra-cult, in which and with which the emperor was worshipped as co-essential with the sun, "consubstantivum soli." Middle and Upper Italy also, as well as the capital, had a large share in the cult.

Did it form, we may ask, any real rival to Christianity throughout the West? This is a question which, in spite of the swift and wide expansion of the cult, I cannot answer in the affirmative. In the first place, we know nothing about the number of its adherents in the different localities; we have much more accurate information upon the

strength of the Christian churches in this respect. Secondly, despite the deep significance of mysteries and conceptions—which, on a superficial view, reveal many points of resemblance to those of Christianity[1] —despite its flexibility and powers of assimilation, Mithraism seldom managed to rise, even in the West (so far as I know), to the higher levels of intellectual culture. The emperor and the army supported it, and thereby it acquired an importance for wider circles in the empire. But a religion whose influence, properly speaking, was confined to the capital and to the outer circumference of the empire—a circumference of which large sections soon lapsed definitely into barbarian hands — such a religion could not possibly win a decisive triumph over the world. Galerius would fain have enforced Mithraism, at the instigation of its priests. For the cult had become a shield and safeguard for all the rest of the decaying

[1] The Fathers of the church do not seem to me to display any serious apprehensions about Mithraism, although of course they are astonished at several points of resemblance between it and Christianity. See, *e.g.*, Tert., *de præscr.* xl.: "Tingit diabolus quosdam, utique credentes et fideles suos, expositionem delictorum de lavacro repromittit: et si adhuc memini, Mithra signat illic in frontibus milites suos; celebrat et panis oblationem et imaginem resurrectionis inducit et sub gladio redimit coronam. quid quod et summum pontificem in unius nuptiis statuit? habet et virgines, habet et continentes" ("The devil baptizes certain folk, his believers and faithful ones, promising remission of sins after immersion. And if I still recollect aright, Mithra there sets a mark on the forehead of his soldiers, celebrates the oblation of bread, introduces a symbol of the resurrection, and wins a crown under the sword. And what are we to say of Satan restricting his high priest to one marriage? The devil, too, has his virgins, and his chaste celibates"); also, *de corona* xv., and particularly a number of earlier passages in the *Apology* and *Dialogue* of Justin.

cults. But the attempt failed, and Constantine gave the quietus to any hopes cherished by the priests of Mithra. Certainly Julian's philosophic worship of the sun, in which even philosophic Hellenism finally tried to establish some point of contact, would have favoured Mithraism. Only, it proved itself abortive.

CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS.

Do the materials thus amassed permit of any conclusions being drawn from them with reference to the statistics of Christianity? Can we get any idea, even approximately, of what was the number of Christians at the period when Constantine ventured to take the extraordinary step of recognizing the religion of the church and of granting privileges to the church itself?[1]

Definite estimates are, of course, out of the question. It is highly precarious to essay any estimate of how large was the population in the separate provinces of the empire and throughout the empire as a whole about the beginning of the fourth century, and how much harder, it may be urged, would it be to calculate, even approximately, the number of Christians? Despite all this, however, we need not abandon hope of some statistical enumeration. For a relative method of calculation promises to yield

[1] In this case, to be recognized was to obtain privileges, just as in modern times the full recognition of the Catholic church is equivalent to granting it a privileged position; admit it with all its pretensions and claims, and you thereby concede it supreme authority.

important results,[1] if we are careful to distinguish one province from another. To form wholesale calculations by lumping everything together, is of no use whatsoever. Thus Gibbon thought he could estimate the number of Christians in the reign of Decius at about a twentieth of the entire population. Friedländer only raises this proportion very slightly, even for the reign of Constantine, while La Bastie and Burckhardt calculate about a twelfth for the same period, and Chastel's total for the East is about a tenth, for the West a fifth, thus leaving on an average a twelfth as well. Matter thought of a fifth, Stäudlin even of a half.[2]

The last named-estimate is decidedly to be rejected. Beyond all question, the number of Christians, even in the West, never amounted to half the population. Even at the opening of the fourth century, Lucian speaks of Christians as constituting "by this time

[1] Unfortunately, as has been already noted, the inscriptions are of hardly any use for our present purpose. Apart from Rome, this number seems to be small upon the whole, till we come down to the beginning of the third century. After that they may be of some importance (as is fairly certain, *e.g.*, in the case of Asia Minor), but we are not in a position to distinguish between those of the third and the fourth century; hardly any of them are dated, while the internal criteria which have been drawn up with regard to those of Rome, Asia Minor, and North Africa, are not quite so reliable from the positive side as they are from the negative.

[2] Richter (*das weströmische Reich*, 1865, p. 79) calculates that there were about 1800 bishoprics all over the 120 provinces of the empire at the close of Constantine's reign. For the period *circa* 312 A.D. we must lower this number (in the West), but otherwise it is scarcely put too high. I should reckon that about 312 A.D. there were between 800 and 900 bishoprics in the East, and between 600 and 700 in the West—though even here one cannot get beyond the region of surmises.

almost a majority in the world" ("pars paene mundi iam maior"); that is, even a Christian of Antioch, who was surveying a section of Asia Minor, did not dream of asserting that Christians already formed half of the local population.

On the other hand, as we shall see, it is extremely probable that in one or two provinces Christianity did embrace a half, or very nearly a half, of the population by the opening of the fourth century, while in several cities Christians already formed a majority, and in fact a large majority, of the inhabitants. Furthermore, Eusebius, who is not much given to exaggeration, describes Christians as "the most populous of peoples" (see above, p. 168), evidently under the impression that there was no people of equal numbers. One Roman writer (see above, p. 151), not long after the middle of the second century, declares that they outnumbered the Jews; and although this statement originally applied to Rome and Italy alone, it was undoubtedly true of the whole empire,[1] ere a century and a half had passed. Christianity must therefore have exceeded its first million long ago.

One important fact must not be overlooked, viz., that as late as the reign of Philip the Arabian the far-travelled Origen found the number of Christians was upon the whole extremely small compared to

[1] Hence we are able to fix the outside limits within which the number of the Christians is to be sought. It must lie somewhere between three and four millions, on the one hand—since even the Jews cannot be reckoned at less than this, at the opening of the third century (cp. vol. i. pp. 10 f.)—and considerably short of half the entire population of the empire on the other. In the East, the number rose above the former limit; while in the West, as will be evident, we must put it considerably lower than the latter.

the total population (see above, p. 177). Such is the opinion of a level-headed observer. It is corroborated by the position of matters as we find it in Cyprian, and it serves to check all those exaggerated outbursts of an earlier age (*e.g.*, Tertullian) which frequently depict the external spread of Christianity as if it involved an inner expansion of equal moment. It would be unwise, therefore, to raise any question at all about what percentage of the population was Christian, with reference to the period *c.* 245 A.D.[1] But ere seventy or eighty years had passed, the council of Nicæa was held. So that *it was during these seventy or eighty years* (*or during the fifty or sixty years previous to Diocletian's persecution*) *that the first notable expansion of the church took place.* By the end of this period Christianity had at all events ceased to be of little moment. Thanks to its very numbers, it now constituted a significant factor in the Roman empire.

The weight of this factor I propose to try and indicate, in the following pages, by means of a brief survey of the various provinces. It must be borne in mind, however, that numerical strength and real influence need not coincide in every case; a

[1] Cyprian corroborates this judgment of Origen, in so far as it may be inferred from his correspondence that the church at Carthage cannot be ascertained to have amounted to many tens of thousands. Including women and children, it may have been from ten to fifteen thousand strong. This enables us to form some rough idea of the strength of Christianity in Proconsular Africa and in Numidia, during the days of Cyprian; perhaps it may have then amounted to between three and five per cent. of the population in the cities. Tertullian's flourishes, of course, touch a far higher percentage; but no reliance is to be placed on him.

small circle may exercise a very powerful influence if its members are largely drawn from the leading classes, whilst a large number may represent quite an inferior amount of influence if it is recruited from the lower classes, or in the main from the country districts. *Christianity was a religion of towns and cities;* the larger the town or city, the larger (even relatively, it is probable) was the number of the Christians. This lent it an extraordinary advantage. But alongside of this, Christianity had already penetrated deep into the country districts, throughout a large number of the provinces, as we know definitely with regard to the majority of the provinces in Asia Minor, no less than as regards Armenia, Syria, Egypt, Palestine, and Northern Africa (with its country towns). Wherever we possess sources bearing on the inner history of the churches in a given province, we come across a series of places, otherwise unknown, with Christian inhabitants, or villages which either contain Christians or are themselves entirely Christian. Compare, for example, the history of Montanism in Phrygia, the treatise of Eusebius upon the Palestinian martyrs, the Testament of the forty martyrs in Armenia, the *Acta Theodoti* (for the district round Ancyra), and the Meletian Acts (for Egypt). All of which shows how deeply Christianity had penetrated the country districts in a number of provinces during the course of the third century, while at the same time it warns us that we must multiply considerably the number of such places as we happen to know of, in order to get any idea of the extent to which Christianity had diffused itself locally.

Instead of attempting to give actual percentages,

I shall rather aim at furnishing four categories or classes of provinces and districts: (1) Those in which Christianity numbered nearly one half of the population and represented the most widely spread or even the standard religion, by the opening of the fourth century; (2) those in which Christianity formed a very material portion of the population, influencing the leading classes and the general culture of the people, and being capable of holding its own with other religions; (3) those in which Christianity was sparsely scattered; and (4) finally, those in which the spread of Christianity was extremely weak, or where it was hardly to be found at all.

The first of these categories includes (1) *the entire province of what constitutes our modern Asia Minor, with the exception of some out-of-the-way districts*, which were then, as they still are, of small account in point of civilization. The process of Christianizing went on apace in the west, north-west, and certain districts of the interior, at an earlier period than in the east, north-east, and south, the local conditions varying here and there; but by the opening of the fourth century the latter districts appear to have equalled the former, becoming almost entirely Christian. The proofs of this have been collected above, on pp. 326 f. In Phrygia, Bithynia, and Pontus there were districts which by this time were practically Christian all over; also there were now towns and villages which contained but few or no pagans. Furthermore, as the numerous chor-episcopi prove, the Lowlands far and wide had been extensively Christianized. Most probably the network of the episcopal organization throughout all the Asiatic

provinces was almost complete by *circa* 300 A.D., and in these provinces the reaction under Julian was unable to make any headway. (2) It includes *that portion of Thrace which lay over against Bithynia, i.e.* Europe (so-called); and (3) *Armenia.* It baffles our powers of judgment to estimate the actual extent to which Christianity was diffused in this country; all we can say is that the Christian religion had by this time become the official religion, and that the royal household was Christian. Eusebius treats the country as a Christian land, and takes the war waged by Maximinus Daza against the Armenians as a religious conflict. (4) Finally, there is *Edessa,* a city which according to Eusebius was entirely Christian. I would not venture to group any other provinces under this category.

The second category includes (1) *Antioch and Coele-Syria*—not merely the maritime towns of Syria and the Greek cities, be it noted, for by this time Christianity must have also penetrated deep into the Syriac population. Also (2) *Cyprus* and (3) *Alexandria, together with Egypt and the Thebais.* The episcopal organization of Egypt as a whole, which commenced by the close of the second century, was substantially finished by the opening of the fourth century, when the new religion had also penetrated deep into the lower non-Hellenic classes, as is proved by the origin and extraordinary spread of monasticism in these circles after the close of the third century, no less than by the rise of the Coptic versions and the ecclesiastical dialect. (4) Then came *Rome, Lower Italy, and certain parts of Middle Italy.* In Rome itself the majority of the upper classes still held aloof,

and the events of the next seventy years show that we must not over-estimate the Christianization of the city by the opening of the fourth century. On the other hand, it is a well-established fact that Christianity was widely represented among the upper and even the highest ranks of society. Thus Eusebius was able to describe how Maxentius began by assuming the mask of friendship towards the Christians (though, of course, he soon changed his tactics), "in order to flatter the people of Rome," while the subsequent elevation of the cross by Constantine within the capital itself met with no resistance. Furthermore, the large number of churches in Rome, and the way in which the city was divided up for ecclesiastical purposes, show how thoroughly it was interspersed with Christians. By 250 A.D. the number of Christians in Rome cannot well have been less than 30,000 (see above, p. 387). Subsequently, by the beginning of the fourth century it was probably doubled, perhaps quadrupled. As for Lower Italy and the districts of Middle Italy which lay in the vicinity of Rome, the fact that sixty Italian bishops could be got together as early as 251 A.D.—bishops who resided in out-of-the-way districts—permits us to infer the existence of quite a considerable Christian population *circa* 300 A.D. This population would be denser wherever Greeks formed an appreciable percentage of the inhabitants, *i.e.* in the maritime towns of Lower Italy and Sicily, although the Latin-speaking population would still remain for the most part pagan. The fact that the Christian church of Rome was predominantly Greek till shortly before the middle of the third century, is proof positive

that up till then the Christianizing of the Latin population in Middle and Lower Italy must have been still in an inchoate stage, although it certainly made rapid strides between 250 and 320. (5) *Africa proconsularis and Numidia.*—We may unhesitatingly reckon these provinces in the present category, since the facts already mentioned prove that the majority of these towns contained Christian communities by the opening of the fourth century, and that the whole country was divided over the Donatist controversy. One might even be disposed to add these provinces to those of the first category, were it not for the inscriptions, which warn us against over-estimating the amount of Christianity in individual towns during the third century. True, the inscriptions are no reliable guide even here. How much Christianity, nay, how much early Christianity even, may lie hid in them! Only, we are no longer able to lay hands on it. (6) *Spain.*—The canons of the synod of Elvira, together with the lists of that synod, justify us (though upon this point I am not quite certain of the facts) in including the Spanish provinces within this category, for these canons show the extent to which Spanish Christianity had become mixed up with local civilization by the year 300, and they also show how deeply it had penetrated all the relationships of life. (7) The overwhelming probability is—to judge from the situation as we find it in the fourth century—that certain (*i.e.* the maritime) parts of *Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia, and the islands* are similarly to be reckoned in this category, as well as *the southern coast of Gaul.*

Our third category will embrace (1) *Palestine,*

where some Greek towns like Cæsarea had a considerable number of Christians, as well as one or two purely Christian localities. As a whole, however, the country offered a stout resistance to Christianity. (2) *Phœnicia*, where the Greek cities on the coast had Christian communities, while the interior, dominated by a powerful and hostile religion, continued to be but slightly affected by Christianity. (3) *Arabia*, where a Christian life of some kind unfolded itself amid the Greco-Latin cities with their peculiar civilization. (4) *Certain districts in Mesopotamia*, (5-12) *the interior of Achaia, of Macedonia, and of Thessaly*, with *Epirus*, *Dardania*, *Dalmatia*, *Mœsia*, and *Pannonia*. The two last-named large provinces adopted Christianity at a comparatively late period (see above, pp. 376 f.), but it must have shot up rapidly once it entered them. (13) *The northern districts of Middle Italy and the eastern section of Upper Italy*. (14) and (15), Mauretania and Tripolitana.

Finally, our fourth category includes—apart from regions outside the empire such as Persia, India, and Scythia (though Western Persia at the opening of the fourth century may be included more accurately, perhaps, in our third category)—(1) *the towns of ancient Philistia*; (2) *the north and north-west coasts of the Black Sea*; (3) *the western section of Upper Italy*—Piedmont having no ecclesiastical organization even by the opening of the fourth century; (4) *Middle and Upper Gaul*; (5) *Belgica*; (6) *Germany*; and (7) *Rhætia*.[1] To get some idea of the sparseness

[1] I do not venture to pronounce any judgment at all on Britain and Noricum, or upon Cyrenaica and Crete.

of Christianity in Belgica, and consequently in Middle and Upper Gaul, as well as in Germany and Rhætia, one has to recollect what has been already said upon the church of Treves (p. 407), and also to compare the facts noted with regard to the church of Cologne. But let me at this point set a small problem in arithmetic. Treves was the most important city in all these provinces, and yet the sole church there certainly cannot have included more than from 500 to 1000 members, while an even smaller total is probably to be fixed. Now, if we assume that twelve bishops, at the very outside, may be counted in Middle and Northern Gaul, Germany, Belgica, and Rhætia put together, and if we multiply this number by 500–700, adding also soldiers and some natives to our total, we get a membership of not more than 10,000 Christians for all these provinces. From which it follows that in a statistical account of the church for the opening of the fourth century, these provinces, together with the rest of those grouped under our fourth category, might be omitted altogether, without any serious loss.

The radical difference between the eastern and the western sections of the empire is particularly striking. Indeed, if one makes the use of Greek or Latin a principle of differentiation, the relative percentage of Christians in the former case becomes higher still. And the explanation is simple enough. While a Greek Christianity had been in existence since the apostolic age, any Latin Christianity worth mentioning dated probably from the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Since the days when the adherents of the Christian faith had got their name in Antioch, Christianity had

ceased to be a Jewish body. Strictly speaking, it had never been such, for it was rooted in what was a counter-movement to the Jewish church, being Hellenistic from the outset. It never divested itself entirely of this Hellenism, neither on Latin nor on Syrian soil. At least, wherever it went, until the close of the second century, it tended to promote the Hellenizing movement, and even at a later period it retained a strongly-marked Hellenistic element which clung to it and urged it on. The transference of the empire's headquarters to the East at once preserved and accentuated the Greek character of the church even as an influence which told upon the western section of the empire—and that at a time when East and West already stood apart, and when a distinctive Latin Christianity accordingly began to shape itself with vigour.[1] But it was the Hellenism of Asia Minor, not that of Egypt, which now took the lead, a Hellenism with elements and associations stretching as far back as the civilization of Persia. *And there lay also the headquarters of the Christian church at the opening of the fourth century.*

We cannot procure any rough and ready figures giving the total percentages of Christians for the

[1] Compare the significant sentences with which Mommsen begins his article on "The Country of Gregorianus" (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Röm. Abt.*, vol. xxii., 1901, pp. 139 f.): "Since Rome had ceased to be, not the capital of the empire, but the residence of its ruler, *i.e.* since the days of Diocletian, the eastern portion of the empire, the partes Orientes, took the lead in every department. This tardy victory of Hellenism over the Latins is perhaps nowhere more surprising than in the sphere of juristic authorship." We may go further without more ado, adding "and in the sphere of theological authorship." Thanks to the Hellenism of Hilary, Ambrose, Rufinus, Jerome, Victorinus, and Augustine,

eastern and the western sections of the empire; and even were such figures available, they would be valueless, for the aspect presented by the separate provinces or groups of provinces is far too varied. More weight attaches to such proofs as we have already led. From these we find that Asia Minor was the most Christian country (with Armenia and Edessa), that, in short, it was practically Christianized; that, in the second place, it is closely followed by Coele-Syria with Antioch, Egypt (and Alexandria), Rome (and Lower Italy), Africa proconsularis and Numidia, and lastly, the maritime districts of Southern Gaul—with regard to the strength of their Christian elements. The resultant picture tells its own tale to the historical expert. If Christianity in these *influential* provinces not merely existed, but existed in large numbers, and existed as a *power* (which, we have seen, was actually the case); if it had already become the dominant power in Asia Minor especially, and if it had already (as has been shown) made its way into the very heart of the army, then it is a matter of almost entire indifference how it fared in the other provinces, or how vigorous was the Christian element in these districts. Moreover, the church was international. Consequently, it was latent, so to

this acquired an entirely new stamp throughout the West; the East simply thrust its problems upon the West during the fourth century, and also brought the West the wealth of its own gifts. Even by the close of the fourth century, the Latins in the church —apart, of course, from Rome and the Roman bishop—felt themselves quite inferior in many respects to the Greeks. Rufinus writes the closing books of his church-history as though the history of the Greek church were really the one thing of importance, all else being a *quantité négligeable.*

speak, as a powerful force even in provinces that were but thinly Christianized. Behind the tiniest isolated church stood the church collective, and this, so far from being a fanciful idea, was a magnitude supremely real.

For a number of years previous to his famous and historical "flight" to Gaul, Constantine stayed at the court of Diocletian in Nicomedia. In one sense of the term, he was no longer a youth when he lived there. He kept his eyes open in a city or province in which he was confronted everywhere with the church, with her episcopate, and with her power over the minds of men. *His Asiatic impressions accompanied him to Gaul*, where they reappeared in the form of political considerations which led him to make his decisive resolve. His most serious opponent, Maximinus Daza, the Augustus of the East, was unteachable; but that very fact made him the most useful tutor Constantine could have had. For the career of Daza made Constantine see as clear as print what were the methods which could not, and therefore dare not, any longer be employed in dealing with Christianity.

It is idle to ask whether the church would have gained her victory even apart from Constantine. Some Constantine or other would have had to come upon the scene. Only, as one decade succeeded to another, it would be all the easier for anyone to be that Constantine. All over Asia Minor, at any rate, the victory of Christianity was achieved before ever Constantine did come on the scene, whilst it was assured throughout the countries mentioned in our second class. Enough to know these facts regarding the spread of

Christianity! It required no special illumination and no celestial army-chaplain (to quote the saying of Lactantius about him) to have this brought to light, or to bring about what was already in existence. All that was needed was an acute and forceful statesman, and *one who at the same time had a vital interest in the religious situation.* Such a man was Constantine. He was gifted, inasmuch as he clearly recognized and firmly grasped what was inevitable. It was not by aid of anything artificial or arbitrary that he laid down the basal principles of his imperial state church; what he did was to let the leading provinces have the religion they desired. Whereupon other provinces had simply to follow suit.

Was there anything remarkable, it may be asked, in the rapidity with which the Christian religion came to extend itself? We have only, it is true, a small amount of parallel material relating to the other religions in the empire, which might serve us for the purposes of such a comparison; still, my reply to such a question would be in the affirmative. The facts of the case do justify the impression of the church-fathers in the fourth century, of men like Arnobius and Eusebius and Augustine—the impression that their faith had spread from generation to generation with inconceivable rapidity.[1] Seventy years after the foundation of the very first Gentile Christian church in Syrian Antioch, Pliny wrote in the

[1] Augustine, in his rhetorical fashion, thinks Christianity must have reproduced itself by means of miracles, for the greatest miracle of all would have been the extraordinary extension of the religion apart from any miracles. See what has been said above (pp. 169 f., the passage from the theophany of Eusebius).

strongest terms about the spread of Christianity throughout remote Bithynia, a spread which in his view already threatened the stability of other cults throughout the province. Seventy years later still, the Paschal controversy reveals the existence of a Christian federation of churches, stretching from Lyons to Edessa, with its headquarters situated at Rome. Seventy years later, again, the emperor Decius declared he would sooner have a rival emperor in Rome than a Christian bishop [vol. i. pp. 351, 352]. And ere another seventy years had passed, the cross was sewn upon the Roman colours.

It has been our endeavour to decipher the reasons for this astonishing expansion. These reasons, on the one hand, were native to the very essence of the religion (as monotheism and as evangel). On the other hand, they lay in its versatility and amazing power of adaptation. But it baffles us to determine the relative amount of impetus exerted by each of the forces which characterized Christianity: to ascertain, *e.g.*, how much was due to its spiritual monotheism, to its preaching of Jesus Christ, to its hope of immortality, to its active charity and system of social aid, to its discipline and organization, to its syncretistic capacity and contour, or to the skill which it developed in the third century for surpassing the fascinations of any superstition whatsoever. Christianity was a religion which proclaimed the living God, for whom man was made. It also brought men life and knowledge, unity and multiplicity, the known and the unknown. Born of the spirit, it soon learnt to consecrate the earthly. To the simple it was simple; to the sublime, sublime. It was a universal religion,

in the sense that it enjoined precepts binding upon all men, and also in the sense that it brought men what each individual specially craved. Christianity became a church, a church for the world, and thereby it secured the use of all possible means of authority, besides the sword itself. It continued to be exclusive, and yet it drew to itself any outside element that was of any value. By this sign it conquered ; for on all human things, on what was eternal and on what was transient alike, Christianity had set the cross.

INDEXES

PASSAGES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

iii. 9 — i. 43
iv. 13 f. — i. 40, 44
v. 7, 44 f. — i. 182
vi. 12 — i. 183
vii. 15 f. — i. 160
viii. 11 — i. 43, 46
x. 1 f. — i. 40
5, 6 f., 23 — i. 41, 106, 242, 368, 435; ii. 170
32 — ii. 3
34-37 — i. 489
42 — i. 183, 434; ii. 2
xi. 13 — i. 416, 434
25 — i. 278
xii. 21 — i. 44
28 — i. 159
48 — ii. 10
xvi. 18 — ii. 11
xviii. 17 — ii. 11
xix. 28 — i. 41, 46, 399
xxi. 21 — ii. 58
28 f. — i. 41 f.
xxiii. 6 f. — i. 417
8 — i. 434; ii. 1, 10
15 — i. 12
xxiv. 9 — ii. 158 f.
14 — ii. 171
xxv. 35 f. — i. 147, 180, 233
xxvii. 19 — ii. 232
xxviii. 19 f. — i. 44 f.; ii. 172

Mark

i. 32, 34, 39 — i. 159
ii. 9 — i. 122
17 — i. 121
iii. 14 — i. 399 f.
15 — i. 159
vi. 13 — i. 159
vii. 27 — i. 41
ix. 38 — i. 160
xi. 17 — i. 43
xii. 16 — i. 42
28, 34 — i. 17, 18
xiii. 9 — i. 41
10 — i. 42
xiv. 9 — i. 42
xvi. 9 — i. 160
17 — i. 160

Luke

i. 61 — ii. 37
ii. — i. 45, 65, 84, 116, 326 f.
iii. 14 — ii. 205
iv. 23 — i. 123
26, 27 — i. 46
34, 41 — i. 159
x. 1 f. — i. 46
xii. 4 — ii. 29
xiii. 28, 29 — i. 46
xvi. 9 — ii. 32

LUKE—*continued*

xxi. 24 i. 46
xxii. 30 i. 46
xxiv. 47 i. 45, 46

JOHN

i. 29 i. 47
iii. 29 ii. 30
iv. 21 f. i. 306 f.
22 i. 47
vii. 48, 49 i. 53
x. 16 i. 47, 83 f., 306
xii. 20 i. 47, 83 f.
xv. 13–15 ii. 29 f.

ACTS

i. 8 i. 46
21 f. i. 405
ii. 18 i. 434
vi. 1 f. i. 54 f., 402
viii. 1 f. i. 57 f.
25 ii. 259
26 f. i. 58
ix. 19 f. i. 59
31 f. i. 50, 51
xi. 26 i. 61, 94; ii. 15 f.
27 f. i. 227; ii. 277
xii. 1 ii. 11
17 i. 50
xiii. 1 i. 59, 65
1 f. i. 108, 419, 421 f.
xiv. 23 ii. 51
xv. i. 68, 88 f., 97
4 ii. 51
23 ii. 97
xvi. 12 ii. 372
xvii. i. 109 f., 475 f.
18 i. 110
28 i. 112
xviii. 2 i. 6
26 ii. 222
xix. 13 i. 163
xx. 28 ii. 51
xxi. 10 f. i. 421
16 ii. 2
20 i. 51; ii. 172 f., 247

ACTS—*continued*

xxii. 4 f. i. 413
xxiv. 5 ii. 5
xxvii. 3 ii. 27 f.
xxviii. 13 f. ii. 391
21 i. 410; ii. 9

ROMANS

i. 8 ii. 382
ii. 8 i. 134
19 i. 12
viii. 29 ii. 31
ix.–xi. i. 305
xi. 25 f. i. 75
xii. 1 i. 281 f.
xiii. 1 f. i. 325 f.
xv. 26 f. i. 228
xvi. 1 f. ii. 89, 196, 219 f., 382
7 i. 401 f.

1 CORINTHIANS

i. 1, 2 i. 473 f.
11 i. 482 f.; ii. 219
26, 27 ii. 183 f.
ii. 3, 4 f. i. 250, 281
v. i. 260
vii. 12 f. ii. 217 f.
14 ii. 8
20 f. i. 207 f.; 382
36 f. ii. 226; 235 f.
ix. 1 f. i. 402
5 i. 50, 403 f.; ii. 249, 250
14 i. 195
x. 32 i. 304
xi. 5 f. i. 289; ii. 218
xii. 2 i. 68, 108
26 i. 225
28 i. 421, 432
xiii. 12 i. 299
xiv. 23 i. 254
34 f. ii. 218
xv. 2, 3 i. 106, 108, 474
xvi. 2 i. 193
19 ii. 218

2 Corinthians

i. 1 ii. 78, 89
3 i. 183
iii. 1 i. 410
viii. 9 i. 228
x. 5 i. 275; ii. 20
xii. 7 i. 161

Galatians

i. 17 ii. 301
22 ii. 11
ii. 10 i. 413; ii. 248
20 i. 124
v. 22 i. 258
vi. 10 i. 201

Ephesians

ii. 14 i. 327; ii. 330
19 ii. 30
20 i. 423
iii. 5 i. 423; ii. 7
iv. 28 i. 193
vi. 12 i. 161
14 f. i. 317; ii. 20

Philippians

i. 1 i. 51
ii. 25 i. 409
iii. 20 i. 315
iv. 2 ii. 220 f.
22 ii. 195, 382

Colossians

ii. 8 i. 275
iii. 11 i. 304, 305
iv. 15 ii 220

1 Thessalonians

i. 9, 10 i. 108
ii. 14 f. i. 50, 53, 75, 229
v. 8 ii. 20
12 f. ii. 51
14 i. 147

2 Thessalonians

ii. 5, 7 i. 325
iii. 6 i. 216
10 i. 215

1 Timothy

ii. 11 f. ii. 225
iii. 1 f. ii. 64 f.
15 i. 277; ii. 12
iv. 1 i. 267
14 i. 419
v. 8 i. 199
9 f. ii. 226
11 f. ii. 225
16 i. 149
vi. 1 f. i. 210

2 Timothy

ii. 3 f. ii. 206
17 i. 138
iii. 6 ii. 225

Titus

i. 5 f. ii. 69, 90
ii. 3 ii. 225
iii. 4 i. 132

Philemon

1 f. ii. 220
23 ii. 20

Hebrews

vi. 10 i. 220
x. 25 ii. 51
32 f. i. 212
34 i. 201
xi. ii. 223
xiii. 2 i. 220
7 i. 418
13 f. i. 315
24 ii. 7

James

i. 27 i. 197
iii. 1 i. 421, 445
15 i. 158
v. 4 f. i. 217
14 i. 148

1 Peter

i. 1 — ii. 96, 330 f., 338
ii. 9 — i. 300
13 f. — i. 326
24 — i. 124
iii. 1 — i. 479; ii. 222
iv. 11 — i. 427
16 — ii. 17

2 Peter

iii. 2 — i. 405, 406

1 John

ii. 27 — i. 289
v. 8 — i. 289
19 — i. 161

2 John

1 f. — ii. 224

3 John

1 f. — i. 224, 399, 436; ii. 48, 95
15 — ii. 28 f.

Revelation

ii. 2 — i. 405
9 — i. 77
20 — ii. 223
23 — i. 146
iii. 9 — i. 77
17 — ii. 330
vii. 4 — ii. 255, 256
9 — ii. 330
xi. 11 — i. 416
xviii. 20 — i. 405
xxi. 14 — i. 399, 405

GENERAL INDEX

Ἅγιοι, ii. 8 f.
Æsculapius, i. 127 f., 144 f.; ii. 325.
Æsthetic, i. 141.
Alkê, ii. 224.
Alms, Christian, i. 185 f.
Angels, worship of, i. 291.
Apollos, i. 401, 414; ii. 222, 305.
Apologists and Christian apologetic, i. 261 f., 282 f., 301 f., 364 f.; ii. 3, etc.
Apostles, Christian, i. 398 f.; ii. 47 f.
Apostles, Jewish, i. 3, 17, 65 f., 409 f.
Apostolic Council (at Antioch), i. 86 f.
Aquila and Priscilla, i. 462; ii. 218 f., 222 f.
Army, Christianity in the, ii. 204 f.
Asceticism, i. 111, 117 f., 262, 267, 272, 478 f.; ii. 291.
Astrology, i. 383 f.
Augustine, ii. 101, 135, 227 f., 431, 463.
Augustus, i. 21, 326–331; ii. 330.
Authority, i. 274 f.

Baptism, i. 285 f., 482 f.; ii. 230, 231.
Baptism, infant, i. 483, 484.
Barnabas, i. 59, 400, 405, 419, 421; ii. 36, 194, 277, 291, 398.
Barnabas, ep. of, i. 78 f., 289, 406; ii. 305.
Βασιλεύς, i. 326.
Basilides, i. 290; ii. 306 f.
"Believers," i. 321; ii. 6 f., 443.
Bible, translations of, i. 471; ii. 270 f., 300, 321, 415.
Birth, narratives of Christ's, i. 84, 115.
Bishops, i. 279 f.; ii. 46 f., 386, 417, 453, etc.
Book, the religion of a, i. 353 f.
"Brethren," ii. 9 f., 31 f.
Burials, Christian interest in, i. 205–207.

Cæsarea, Alexander of, ii. 339 f.
Cæsars, worship of the, i. 371 f.; ii. 327, 449.
Calamities, Christians and, i. 212 f.
Catacombs, Sicilian, ii. 392, 393.
Catechumens, i. 454, 488.
Catholic epistles, i. 247, 428 f.
"Catholic," the term, ii. 13 f.
Celsus, i. 130 f., 177 f., 261, 278 f.; ii. 129 f., etc.
Charity, practical, i. 181 f.
Chor-episcopi, ii. 100 f., 269, 353, 360, etc.
Christianity, cosmopolitan, i. 307, 318 f., 322 f.
"Christian," the name, i. 60, 89, 94 f.; ii. 15 f., 38, 123, 243, 277.
Chronography, Christian, i. 319.
Church, as an authority, i. 277 f.
Church and churches, the, ii. 49 f., 67 f.

Church, heightened value of, ii. 52 f.
"Church," use of term, ii. 11 f.
Collection, the Pauline, i. 227 f.
Communism, early Christian, i. 187.
Confession, duty of open, i. 264, 367 f.
Constantine, i. 280; ii. 126 f., 260 f., 345, 406, 465.
Conversions, i. 488 f.
Counsels of perfection, i. 107, 271 f., 281.
Court, the imperial, ii. 189 f., 192 f.
Cultus, the Christian, i. 190 f., 362; ii. 52 f.
Cyprian, i. 150, 188, 191, 213, 231 f., 472; ii. 21 f., 38 f., 81 f., 103 f., 140 f., 176, 237, 416 f., 418 f., 437 f.

Deaconesses, i. 149, 199; ii. 226.
Deacons, i. 149 f., 199 f., 201, 220.
Demons, belief in, i. 152 f.
Diaspora, number of Jews in, i. 4 f.
Diognetus, epistle to, i. 317; ii. 173.
Disciples, see under *μαθηταί*.
Domestic life, Christianity and, i. 489 f.
Domitian, i. 372; ii. 166, 185, 194 f., 243, 249.

Ebionites, ii. 5 f., 248, 251 f.
Ecstasy, i. 251 f.
Ἐκκλησία, see under Church.
Employment, worldly, i. 193, 215 f., 381 f.
Epictetus, i. 266.
Episcopate, see under Bishop.
Episcopate, monarchical, i. 279 f., 431, 454 f.; ii. 57 f.
Essential Christianity, i. 48, 109 f., 397; ii. 145 f., 467.
Eusebius, i. 94 (on name of "Christian"), 129 (on Jesus), 284 (on Christianity); ii. 86 f., 179 f. (on spread of Christianity), 191, 257 f., 269.
Evangelists, i. 401, 419, 423 f., 431, 437.
Exorcists, i. 152 f., 159 f.
Expansion of Christianity, stages in the, ii. 122, 144 f., 182, 422.
Extension of Christianity, rapidity of, ii. 466 f.

Faith, power of blind, i. 278 f.
Festivals, pagan, i. 255, 376 f.; ii. 214, 216, 236.
Florian, St, ii. 378.
Foreign churches, care for, i. 220 f.
"Friends," use of term, ii. 25 f.

Galen, i. 266 f., 338, 339.
"Galileans," i. 97; ii. 5.
Games, the heathen, i. 376 f.; ii. 351 f.
Gnosticism (see also Syncretism), i. 30, 112 f., 141 f., 290 f., 296 f., 308, 353; ii. 229 f., 371.
Gospel, individual and social, i. 184 f.; ii. 48 f.
Guardian spirits, belief in, i. 167; ii. 40, 44, etc.

Healing, Christianity as the Gospel of, i. 121 f.
Heathen, missions to, i. 54 f., 108 f.; ii. 170 f.
Hellenism, influence of, i. 19 f., 74 f., 112 f., 454; ii. 129 f., 136 f., 302, 326 f., 341 f., 349 f., 447 f., 463.
Hellenists, in Jerusalem, i. 55 f.
Heresy and heretics, i. 312 f.; ii. 62 f., 293, 443 f.

Hermas, i. 117 f., 197 f., 425–429, 445 f., 468; ii. 381, 383, 391.
Heroes, spiritual, i. 272, 450; ii. 8, 54.
Hippolytus, i. 162, 203, 311, 313, 331; ii. 116, 157, 176, 239, 290, 347 f.
Holiness, development of the idea of, i. 265 f.; ii. 8, 9.
Hospitality, i. 219 f.
Hypsistarii, i. 3; ii. 327, 341.

Idolatry, attacks on, i. 98 f., 367.
Ignatius, i. 236 f., 289, 406 f.; ii. 52, 89, 98 f., 223 f., 236, 383.
Imitation of Christ, i. 107.
Immorality, crusade against, i. 151; ii. 441 f.
Impostors, Christian, i. 443, 480 f.
Inscriptions, i. (p. ix.), 3, 208, 412; ii. 39, 41 f., 185, 192 f., 196 f., 243, 275, 336, 358, 362 f., 370, 378, 421, 434.
Israel, the true, i. 301 f.
Irenæus, i. 82 (on Old Testament), 165 f. (on demons), 255, 256 (on charismatic gifts); ii. 75 f., 174 f., 308, 400, 402 ff.
Itinerants, i. 66 f., 428 f., 436 f., 453, 462 f.

James, the Lord's brother, i. 50, 51.
Jesus, relatives of, ii. 243, 247, 253.
Jesus Christ and the universal mission, i. 40 f.
Jesus Christ, his preaching, i. 121 f.
Jewish Christians, i. 68 f., 72 f.
Jews, attitude of, i. 66 f.
Jews, mission to the, i. 50 f., 106 f.
Jews, persecutions by, i. 3, 66; ii. 193.
Jews at Rome, i. 5 f. 336 f.; ii. 192 f.
John's Gospel, i. 46 f., 83 f., 298, 306 f., 317, 479; ii. 137.
Judaism, a universal religion, i. 11 f., 392.
Judaism and public opinion, i. 336 f.
Judaism, its numbers, i. 10 f.; ii. 174, etc.
Judaism and its propaganda, i. 14 f.
Judaism and the State, i. 2 f., 323 f.
Julian, i. 351; ii. 5, 451, etc.
Justin, i. 77–80 (on Jews), 108 f., 164 f. (on demons), 189, 264 (on Christian morals), 284, 291 (on angels), 292, 311, 319, 327 (on Christian loyalty), 355, 356, and 489 (his conversion), 448, 449, 463 f. (a traveller), 490; ii. 173 (on spread of Christianity), 383 (his trial).

Labour, emphasis on duty of, i. 215 f.
Latin Christianity, ii. 462–464.
Letters, function of Christian, see under Catholic epistles.
Literature, circulation of, i. 462 f.
Love, Christian, i. 213 f., 239 f.; ii. 9, 49.
Lucian, i. 134, 235 f.; ii. 128, etc.
Luther, i. 15.
Luxury, i. 198, 380.
Lydia, ii. 221.

Magic, i. 292 f.; ii. 139.
Marcion, i. 64, 81, 299; ii. 383, 445 f.
Manicheans, i. 393 f.; ii. 296 f., 445.
Marriages, mixed, ii. 217 f., 235 f.

Martyrs, i. 264 f., 368 f., 458 f.; ii. 120 f., 178, 205, 310 f., 343 f., 351 f., 408, 413 f.
Μαθηταί, ii. 1 f.
Medicinal metaphors, i. 131 f.
Melito, i. 328 f., 465; ii. 151.
Methods of Christian propaganda, i. 102 f., 473 f.; ii. 46 f.
Metropolitans, ii. 64 f., 389, etc.
Military class, the, i. 385 f.; ii. 204 f., 448 f.
Military metaphors, i. 317 f.; ii. 20 f., 415.
Miracles, i. 257; ii. 70.
Missionaries, the Christian, i. 398 f.
Missionary preaching, i. 15, 104 f.; ii. 145 f.
Mithraism, i. 321, 461; ii. 447 f.
Monasticism, ii. 229, 316, 417.
Monotheism, i. 36 f., 282 f., 375.
Morality, i. 260 f., 316, 488 f.; ii. 54.
Mysteries, the Christian, i. 286 f., 485 f.
Mysteries, pagan, i. 35, 486.

Names of Christians, ii. 35 f., 263.
Narcissiani, ii. 196.
"Nazarenes," i. 53; ii. 5.
Neoplatonism, i. 393 f.; ii. 136 f.
Nero, ii. 116, 163.
Number of Christians (see also under various provinces), ii. 235, 311.

Oaths, i. 372, 385 f.
Offices, civil, i. 384 f.; ii. 187 f., 201 f., 282 f., 374.
Officials, support of Christian, i. 195 f.; ii. 386, 411.
Ordination, ii. 67 f.
"Orientalism," i. 30 f.
Origen, i. 178 f., 453 f., 492; ii. 140 f., 177 f., etc.

Pagan elements in Christianity, i. 291 f., 395; ii. 327 f., 341, 349 f., 417 f., 437 f., 441 f.
"Pagan," origin of term, i. 317 f.; ii. 22 f.
Paul, i. 53 f., 69 f., 185, 402 f.; ii. 39 f., 137, etc.
Pentecost, ii. 160.
Persecutions, i. 178, 201 f., 229 f., 323 f.; ii. 112, 400 f.
Peter, i. 57, 70 f.; ii. 39 f., etc.
Philosophers, Christian, i. 447 f.; ii. 188.
Philosophers, pagan, see Celsus and Porphyry.
Philosophic schools, i. 447 f., 457 f.
Philosophy, Christian view of, i. 458, 480 f.
Philosophy, Judaism a, i. 14.
Πιστοί, see under Believers.
Plagiarisms, i. 318 f.
Pliny, i. 266 f.; ii. 116 f., 172 f., 331.
Polemic, anti-Christian, i. 338 f.; ii. 127 f.
Political standpoint of Christians, i. 303 f., 323 f.
Polytheism, i. 26 f., 170, 364 f.
Poor, care of the, i. 190 f.
Porphyry, i. 126, 350 f., 396, 484; ii. 122 f., 129 f.
Presbyters, i. 242, 246, 450 f.; ii. 61 f., 65 f., 343.
Priesthood, i. 394.
Prisoners, care for, i. 203 f.
Prophets, Christian, i. 142, 415.
Prophets, Jewish, i. 142, 415.
Prophets, women, i. 166, 443; ii. 228 f., 340.
Proselytes, i. 12 f., 54, 58 f., 488.

Quakers, the, ii. 34.

Race, Christianity the third human, i. 300 f.

Raising the dead, i. 166, 255 f.
Rationalism, early Christian, i. 284
Reactions against Christianity, Jewish, i. 57 f., 64 f., 409 f.
Reactions, pagan, i. 29; ii. 115 f.
Recompense, idea of, i. 116 f.
Resurrection of Christ, i. 115 f.
Riches, i. 117 f., 183 f.
Roman Christianity, prestige of, i. 230 f., 466 f., 470 f.; ii. 379 f., 445, 453, 458, 459.

"Sacrament," ii. 22.
Sacraments, attractiveness of, i. 286 f.
"Saints," ii. 7 f.
"Sect," ii. 13.
Sick, visiting the, i. 150, 163.
Simon Magus, adherents of, ii. 162, 165, 256.
Sins, forgiveness of, i. 268 f.
Slaves, Christian, i. 207 f. (cp. p. 24).
Speculation, early Christian, i. 112 f.
Spirit, activities of the Holy, i. 254 f.
State, the, i. 322 f., 342 f., 371 f.
Statistics of Judaism, i. 8 f.
Statistics of Christianity, ii. 60 f., 321 f., 387, 419 f., 452
Stephen, i. 52 f., 55 f.
"Strangers and pilgrims," i. 315 f.; ii. 13, 55.
Supper, the Lord's, i. 286 f.; ii. 53.
Symbolism, i. 29 f., 289 f.
Synagogue, Jewish, i. 1 f., 345; ii. 47, 115, 192.
"Synagogue," ii. 11 f.
Synods, church, ii. 59 f., 328 f.
Syncretism, i. 37 f., 296 f., 391 f.; ii. 327 f., 467.
Σώτηρ, i. 124, 129 f.

Tacitus, i. 5 f.; ii. 18 f.
Tatian, i. 168, 262, 307, 355 f., 370 f., 448; ii. 293 f., 446.
Teacher, Christ the, ii. 1 f.
Teachers, Christian, i. 320 f., 416 f., 419 f., 444 f.; ii. 357 f.
Tertullian, i. 38, 114, 139, 151, 153 f. (on demons), 189, 199, 202, 205 ff., 216 f., 259, 261, 275, 276 (on inquiry), 292, 307, 322–324 (on the State), 329, 340 f. (defending Christians), 354, 361 (on Old Testament), 365 ff. (on polytheism), 372 f., 442, 455 f., 458, 479 f., 485 f. (on baptism), 490; ii. 17, 21 f. (military language), 37, 117, 118, 121 f., 153 f. (on expansion of Christianity), 187, 207 f. (on soldiers), 225 f. (on women), 230 f., 329, 409, 412 f., 450 (on Mithra).
Testament, the Old, i. 77 f., 353 f.
Thaumaturgus, Gregory, ii. 350 f.
Theatres, i. 376 f.
Themison, i. 429.
Thomas, Acts of, ii. 278, 279, 293.
Travels, Christian, i. 21, 223.
Trinity, idea of the, i. 39, 111, 482.
Twelve apostles, the, i. 84–85, 438 f.; ii. 166.

Universalism, Christian, i. 40 f.; ii. 145.

Valentinus, i. 290, 327, 464; ii. 14, 30, 33, 186, 291, 307.
Villages, Christians in (see also under Chor-episcopi), ii. 23, 268, 343, 446, 456.
Visions, i. 251 f., 481 f.; ii. 229, 348.
Wealth, Christianity and, see under Luxury.

Widows, care of, i. 149, 197 f.
"Wisdom" (see under Gnosticism and Hellenism), i. 274 f., 295 f.
Women, Christianity and, i. 460, 479, 492; ii. 183 f., 217 f., 285.
Women, Callistus and, i. 211, 212; ii. 180, 238 f., 385.
Work, obligation of, i. 215 f.
World, Christian view of the history of the, i. 302 f.
World, stern attitude to the, i. 118.
Worldliness, see under Pagan elements.
Worship, public, ii. 51 f.

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

Abbadis, *see* Vadæ.
Abbir Cellense, ii. 425.
„ Germaniciana, ii. 425.
„ maius, ii. 425.
„ minus ii. 425.
Abitini, i. 456, 492; ii. 425, 433.
Abyssinia, *see* Ethiopia.
Acbia, ii. 426.
Acci, ii. 439.
Achaia, i. 228; ii. 78, 89 f., 460 f.
Acinipo, ii. 440.
Adana, ii. 325.
Ad Badias, ii. 431.
Ad Maiores, ii. 431.
Ad Medera, ii. 426.
Adraa, ii. 254.
Adriani, ii. 355.
Adrianopolis, ii. 375.
Advingi, ii. 440.
Ægea, ii. 234.
Ægina, ii. 371.
Ælia, *see* Jerusalem.
Africa, i. 4 f., 464 f.; ii. 23, 101 f., 411 f., 460, etc.
Agbia, ii. 426.
Ageæ, ii. 325 f.
Agen, ii. 405.
Agense Oppidum, ii. 426.
Aggya, ii. 426.
Aila, ii. 259, 267.
Aïn Kebira, ii. 434.
Ajune, ii. 440.
Akmonia, ii. 358, 363.
Alasus, ii. 273.
Alatina, ii. 433.
Albano, ii. 392.
Albans, St, ii. 410.
Alexandreiopolis, ii. 307 f.
Alexandria, i. 5 f., 212, 448 f. (school at), 459; ii. 189 f., 209 f., 234, 244, 262 f., 305 f., 308, 320 f., 458.
Alexandria, canton of, ii. 307.
Alexandria parva, ii. 324.
Alex-Island, ii. 312.
Alistra, ii. 369.
Alphokranon, ii. 318.
Alutina, *see* Alatina.
Amasia, ii. 214, 335, 348, 361.
Amastris, i. 248; ii. 79 f., 246, 322 f., 347.
Ambiensis, ii. 433.
Amblada, ii. 363.
Amida (= Diarbekir), ii. 297.
Amiens, ii. 405.
Amisus, i. 2; ii. 244, 332.
Amiternum, ii. 392.
Ammedera, ii. 426.
Ammoniace, ii. 310.
Amorion, ii. 363.
Amphipolis, ii. 243.
Anacipolis (?), ii. 315.
Anæa, ii. 367.
Anazarbus, ii. 325.
Anchialus, ii. 246, 375.
Ancona, ii. 393.
Ancyra, ii. 77, 87, 103, 246, 332, 359 f., 456.
Ancyra ferrea, ii. 367.
Andalusia, ii. 436.
Andrapolis, ii. 299.
Andujar, ii. 440.
Anea, ii. 259, 267 f.
Angers, ii. 405.
Anim, ii. 260 f., 267.
Antaradus, ii. 273.
Anthedon, ii. 265.
Antinoe, ii. 312 f., 317, 319, 322.
Antioch (Isaurian), ii. 369.
„ (Carian), ii. 367.
„ (Pisidian), i. 3 f.; ii. 243, 363.
„ (Syrian), i. 2 f., 14, 59 f., 68 f., 86 f., 227 f., 236 f., 421 f., 454 f., 463; ii. 89 f., 99 f., 243 f., 276 f., 387, 466, etc.

Antipyrgus, ii. 319.
Antium, ii. 391.
Apamea (Bithyn.), ii. 355.
„ (Phrygian), ii. 245, 333, 362 f.
„ (Pisidian), ii. 364.
„ (Syrian), i. 71, 465; ii. 278, 287 f., 361.
Aphaka, ii. 275.
Aphrodisias, ii. 243.
Apollonia, ii. 367.
Apollonias (Bithyn.), ii. 355.
„ (Carian), ii. 368.
Aprocavistus, ii. 288.
Apt, ii. 404.
Aptungi, ii. 432.
Apulia, ii. 393.
Aquæ Regiæ, ii. 428.
Aquæ Tibilitanæ, ii. 432.
Aquila, ii. 393.
Aquileia, ii. 397 f.
Aquitania, ii. 74, 405.
Arabia, i. 231; ii. 254, 299, 300 f., 389, 461.
Aradus, i. 2; ii. 272.
Arbela, ii. 298.
Arbokadama, ii. 288.
Ardabau, ii. 245, 333, 362.
Areopolis, *see* Rabba.
Arethusa, ii. 288 f.
Argos, ii. 372.
Ariace, ii. 159 f.
Aricia, ii. 391.
Arles, ii. 74 f., 403, etc.
Armenia, ii. 79 f., 105 f. 342 f., 458, etc.
Arnem, ii. 252.
Arpiensium civitas, ii. 393.
Arragon, ii. 436.
Arsinoë, ii. 312 f., 318.
Arycanda, ii. 125, 336, 368.
Ascoli Pic., ii. 393.
Ascalon, ii. 259 f.
Ashdod, ii. 243.
Asia Minor, i. 3 f., 327; ii. 174, 326 f., 457, 464, 465, etc.
'Asker, *see* Sichar.
Aspendus, ii. 369.
Assisi, ii. 393.
Assuras, ii. 426.
Assus, ii. 243.
Assyria, *see* Syria.
Astaroth, ii. 252.
Astigi, ii. 440.
Aštišat, ii. 345 f.
Asturica (Astorga), ii. 436, 437.
Ategua (Ateva), ii. 440.
Athens, i. 243, 334 f., 475 f.; ii. 243, 372 f., etc.
Athribitic canton, ii. 307 f., 318.
Attalia, ii. 243, 369.
Attica, ii. 372.
Augsburg, ii. 234, 490.
Aulana, ii. 260.
Aulona (*see* Anea), ii. 269.
Aurelianopolis, ii. 367.
Aureus Mons, ii. 392.
Ausafa, ii. 426.
Ausuaga, ii. 426.
Autumni, *see* Aptungi.
Autun, ii. 107, 404 f.
Auxerre, ii. 405.
Auzia, i. 4; ii. 434.
Auzuaga, ii. 426.
Avellino, ii. 393.
Axiupolis, ii. 377.
Axum, ii. 251, 299.
Azani, ii. 362.
Azotus, ii. 259.
Babylonia, i. 2 f.; ii. 243.
Baccano (Baccanas), ii. 393.
Bactria, ii.
Badæ, ii. 431.
Badis, ii. 431.
Bætica, ii. 439 ff.
Bagai, ii. 426.
Bagis, ii. 367.
Bakatha (Bakathus), ii. 303.
Balaneæ, ii. 288.
Balkan peninsula, ii. 371 f., 396.
Ballis, ii. 433.
Bamacorra, ii. 426.
Barata, ii. 369.
Barbe, ii. 440.
Barbary, ii. 417 f., 435.
Barca, ii. 440.
Barcelona, ii. 439.
Baris, ii. 364.
Barkê, ii. 319.
Basanitis, ii. 254 f.
Basti, ii. 439.
Batana, ii. 298.
Batanea, ii. 254 f.
Batanæa, near Cæsar. Pal., ii. 260, 268.
Beauvais, ii. 405.
Belgica, ii. 400 f., 461 f.
Beneventum, ii. 392.
Bereitan (Berothai), ii. 303.
Berenicê, ii. 86 f., 313 f., 319, 323.
Beretane (?), ii. 303.
Bergamo, ii. 397.
Berœa (Maced.), ii. 222, 243, 372.
„ (Syrian), ii. 251 f., 290.
Berytus, ii. 273 f., 292.
Bescera, ii. 431.

Bethabara, ii. 260, 268.
Beth Gubrin, ii. 259, 269.
Bethlehem, i. 229; ii. 259, 267.
Bethphage ii. 261.
Bettona, ii. 393.
Biltha, ii. 426.
Bisica Lucana, ii. 427.
Bithynia, ii. 244, 353 f., 447, 457, 467, etc.
Black Sea, i. 3; ii. 378 f., 461.
Blaundus, *see* Standus.
Bobba, *see* Obba.
Bolitana civitas, ii. 433.
Bologna, ii. 397 f.
Bomotheus, ii. 319.
Bordeaux, i. 20; ii. 405.
Bosphorus, ii. 80 f., 378 f.
Bostra, i. 463; ii. 256, 281, 300 f.
Bourges, ii. 405.
Brescia, ii. 397.
Brindissi, ii. 380.
Britain, *see* England.
Bruzos, ii. 362.
Bubastis, ii. 318.
Bubiduna, ii. 433.
Bucolia, ii. 322.
Bulla, ii. 426.
Buruc, ii. 427.
Busiris, ii. 318.
Buslacena, ii. 427.
Buthrotus, ii. 375.
Byblus, ii. 275 f.
Byzacium, ii. 414 f.
Byzantium, i. 464; ii. 246, 375.

Cabra, ii. 440.
Cærleon, ii. 410.
Cæsaraugusta, ii. 437, 438 f.
Cæsarea (Bith.) ii. 355.
,, (Cappad.) i. 463; ii. 79 f., 210 f., 338 f.
,, (Mauret.), i. 4; ii. 432.
,, (Palest.) ii. 243, 256 f., 260 f., 265 f., 461, etc.
,, Philippi, *see* Paneas.
Cæsena, ii. 392.
Cagliari, ii. 393.
Calabria, ii. 80 f.
Calagurris - Fibularia, ii. 440.
Calahorra, ii. 438.
Calama, ii. 423, 432.
Camalodunum, ii. 411.
Campsas (?), ii. 355.
Capernaum, ii. 261.
Capitolias, ii. 259.
Cappadocia, i. 2 f. (Jews in), 205; ii. 229, 232 f., 243, 338 f., 379.
Capsa, ii. 427.
Capua, ii. 392.
Caria, i. 2; ii. 367 f.
Carpi, ii. 427.
Carrhæ, ii. 216, 294 f.
Carthage, i. 4, 213 f., 235, 346; ii. 156, 246, 412 f., 418 f., 435, 440, 455.
Carula, ii. 440.
Carthagena, ii. 439.
Cartenna, ii. 433.
Casæ Nigræ, ii. 432.
Castra Galbæ, ii. 427.
Castellona, ii. 440.
Castulo, ii. 439 f.
Catalonia, ii. 436.
Catania, ii. 394.
Cazlona, ii. 439.
Cedia, ii. 427.
Celts, ii. 75 ff., 152 ff., 402 f.
Cenchreæ, ii. 243, 374.
Centurionis, ii. 432.
Cephalitana possessio, ii. 434.
Cephallenia, ii. 371.
Chaduthi, ii. 343.
Chalcedon, ii. 355.
Chalcis, ii. 372.
Châlons, ii. 405.
Charisphone, ii. 343.
Chartres, ii. 405.
Chenebri, ii. 319.
Chenoboscium, ii. 316.
Cherchel, ii. 433.
Cherson, ii. 379.
Chios, ii. 370.
Choraba, *see* Kochaba.
Chullabi, ii. 427.
Cibaliana, ii. 427.
Cibalis, ii. 377.
Cicabis, ii. 420, 433.
Cilicia, i. 3 f. (Jews in), 59 f., 203, 412; ii. 324 f., 359 f.
Cillium, ii. 424.
Cirta, i. 4; ii. 422, 427.
Civita Vecchia, ii. 393.
Claudiopolis, ii. 369.
Cleopatris, ii. 318.
Clermont, ii. 403, 405.
Clusium, ii. 394.
Cnidos, i. 2.
Cnossus, ii. 246, 370, 371.
Coele-Syria, *see* Syria.
Cologne, ii. 246, 408 f.
Colonia (Cappad.), ii. 338.
Colosse, ii. 220, 243, 361.
Commagene, ii. 326 f.
Como, ii. 397.
Complutum, ii. 438.
Constantinople, ii. 328, 355.
Copts, ii. 300, 321.

Corcyra, ii. 370.
Cordova, ii. 380, 438, 439 f.
Corinth, i. 188 f., 244 f., 443; ii. 243, 372 f.
Crete, i. 59 f., 248; ii. 79 f., 243, 370 f.
Ctesiphon, *see* Seleucia.
Cuicul, ii. 426, 427.
Cumæ, ii. 394.
Curubis, ii. 427.
Cusæ, ii. 317.
Cyprus, i. 2 f., 59 f.; ii. 291 f., 458.
Cyrene (Cyrenaica, Pentapolis), i. 2 f.; ii. 80 f., 246, 304 f. 322 f.
Cyrrus, ii. 288 f.
Cyzikus, ii. 367.

Dacia, ii. 157 f., 371 f., 448.
Dalmatia, ii. 376 f., 461.
Damascus, i. 4 f.; ii. 243, 275, 276.
Dara, ii. 298.
Dardania, ii. 80 f., 375, 461.
Darnis (Dardanis), ii. 319.
Debeltum, ii. 84, 246, 375.
Decapolis, ii. 252 f.
Deir Ali, ii. 275 f.
Delos, i. 2.
Der 'at, ii. 254.
Derbe, ii. 243, 363.
Diana (Veteranorum), ii. 427.
Didensis, ii. 427.
Die (Gaul), ii. 380, 404 f.
Digne, ii. 405.
Dikella, ii. 319.
Diocæsarea (Cappad.), *see* Nazianzus.
Diocæsarea (Isaur.), ii. 369.
„ (Palest.), ii. 261 f.
Diodoris, ii. 298.
Dionysiana, ii. 437.
Dioscome, ii. 362.
Diospolis (Egypt), ii. 317.
„ (Palest.), *see* Lydda.
Diospontus, ii. 348, 361.
Dokimion, ii. 358.
Doliche, ii. 288.
Dorostorium, ii. 376.
Dorylæum, ii. 362.
Drepana, ii. 355.
Drizipara (Drusipara), ii. 375.
Drona, ii. 440.
Duja, *see* Die.

Eauze, ii. 405.
Ecdaumana, ii. 361.
Edessa, i. 84, 122; ii. 103, 245, 278, 292 f., 353, 410, 458.
Egypt, i. 2 f. (Jews in), 162 f., 451 f. (teachers in); ii. 90 f., 246, 304 f., 458.
Elatæa, ii. 372.
Elepel, ii. 440.
Eleutheropolis, ii. 259, 263, 267.
Eliocrota, ii. 440.
Elvira, i. 4, 211, 217; ii. 439 f.
Emmaus, ii. 253, 259, 266.
Embrun, ii. 408.
Emerita, *see* Merida.
Emesa, ii. 91 f., 274.
England, ii. 410, 411, 448.
Epagro, ii. 440.
Ephesus, i. 237 f.; ii. 29, 79 f., 243, 365 f., etc.
Epibata, ii. 375.
Epiphania (Cilic.), ii. 325, 361.
„ (Syrian), ii. 288.
Epirus, ii. 375, 461.
Esbus, ii. 303.
Ethiopia, ii. 102, 160, 323 f.
Eubœa, ii. 372, 375.
Eucarpia, ii. 362.
Eumenea (Phryg.), ii. 245, 333, 358 f., 362, etc.
"Europe," ii. 86 f., 371 f., 458.
Evora, ii. 439.

Faënza, ii. 392.
Fano, ii. 394.
Faro, ii. 439.
Ferentino, ii. 394.
Fermo, ii. 394.
Flavias, ii. 325.
Florence, ii. 392 f.
Forum Claudii, ii. 392.
Fruschka Gora, ii. 378.
Fundi, ii. 392.
Furni, ii. 103, 422, 427.

Gabbala, ii. 288.
Gabrum, ii. 440.
Gabula, ii. 288.
Gadamana, ii. 361.
Gadara, ii. 259, 267.
Gadiaufala, ii. 427.
Gæta, ii. 393.
Gaetuli, ii. 157.
Gafsa, ii. 427.
Gagæ, ii. 369.
Galatia, i. 228; ii. 81 f., 243, 356 f.

Galilee, i. 53; ii. 5, 249 f.
Gallicia, ii. 439.
Gangra, ii. 347.
Garbe, ii. 432.
Gaul, i. 4, 20; ii. 73 f., 106 f., 152 f., 399 f., 460, 461.
Gaza, ii. 91 f., 259 f., 262 f.
Gazaufala, ii. 427.
Gelæ, ii. 296.
Gemella, ii. 440.
Gemellæ, ii. 427.
Genoa, ii. 396, 397.
Georgia, ii. 285, 353.
Gerasa, ii. 303.
Germanicia, ii. 288.
Germaniciana, ii. 428.
Germany, ii. 152 f., 408 f., 448, 461.
Gerunda (Gerona), ii. 439.
Gibar, *see* Girba.
Gindarus, ii. 288.
Girba (Girha), ii. 428.
Girgenti, ii. 394.
Gor, ii. 428.
Gorduba, ii. 428.
Gorthyna, i. 2, 247; ii. 78 f., 246, 370, 371.
Gothia, ii. 80 f., 378 f.
Granada, ii. 436, 440.
Greece, ii. 59, 188, 373 f., 460.
Greater Greece, *see* Italy.
Grenoble, ii. 405.
Grimenothyræ, ii. 362.
Guadix, ii. 439.
Gurgites, ii. 438.
Gustra (= Ostra), ii. 297.

Hadrianopolis, ii. 303.
Hadrumetum, i. 4; ii. 414, 424.
Halicarnassus, i. 2.
Harbath Glal., ii. 298.
Harran, *see* Carrhæ.
Helenopolis, *see* Drepana.
Helenopontus, ii. 357.
Heliopolis (Egyptian), ii. 318.
Heliopolis (Phœnician), ii. 274 f.
Henchir-el-Atech., ii. 434.
Henchir-Harat, ii. 430.
Henschir Tambra, ii. 428.
Heraclea, ii. 375.
Heracleopolis magna et parva, ii. 317.
Hermethes (?), ii. 317.
Hermopolis magna et parva, ii. 312 f., 317 f.
Hierapolis (Phrygian), i. 463, ii. 99, 228, 342 f. 361.
Hierapolis (Syrian), ii. 288.
Hierocasarea, ii. 367.
Hieropolis, ii. 245.
Hippo, i. 4. (H. Regius, ii. 428; H. Diarrhytus, ii. 428).
Horrea Cælia, ii. 428.
Huasades, ii. 369.
Humanades, ii. 369.
Hybla maior, ii. 394.
Hypapa, ii. 367.
Hypselis, ii. 319.
Hyrgal District, ii. 362.

Iberia, ii. 85 f., 353.
Iconium, i. 453; ii. 227, 243, 358, 363.
Igabrum, ii. 440.
Ilipula, ii. 440.
Ilium, ii. 367.
Ilium aliud, ii. 367.
Illiberis, ii. 440.
Illiturgi, ii. 440.
Illyria, ii. 244.
Imola, ii. 397.
India, ii. 299, 304, 461.
Ionopolis, ii. 347.
Ipagrum, ii. 439.
Ireland, ii. 417.
Irenopolis, *see* Neronias.
Isauria, ii. 368 f.
Islands, Greek, ii. 370, 371, 460.
Italica, near Seville, ii. 436, 439.
Italy, i. 20 f.; ii. 458 f. (See also Upper Italy, ii. 395 f.).
Iturææ, ii. 254.

Jamnia, ii. 259 f.
Jattir, ii. 260 f., 267.
Jericho, ii. 259 f.
Jerusalem, i. 49 f., 409 f.; ii. 243, 247 f., 256 f., 413.
Joppa, ii. 221, 243, 259, 266.
Judæa, i. 50 f.; ii. 96, 249 f.
Juliopolis, ii. 361.

Kalytis (Kanytis?), ii. 364.
Kamulia, ii. 338.
Kariathaim, ii. 303.
Karina, ii. 366.
Karnaim, ii. 252.
Karnaim Astaroth, ii. 254.
Karystus, ii. 372.
Kaschkar, ii. 299.
Kastabala, ii. 325.
Kephro, ii. 313.
Keramon Agora, ii. 363.
Kerioth, ii. 303.
Kerkuk, ii. 298.
Khoba, ii. 254.

Kibyra, ii. 368.
Kina, ii. 361.
Kius, ii. 355.
Kochaba, ii. 249 f.
Kokâb el Hawâ, ii. 253.
Kokâb, ii. 253.
Kolluthion, ii. 313.
Koma, ii. 319.
Komana (Cappad.), ii. 99, 338.
„ (Pontus), ii. 348.
Koptus, ii. 317.
Koronia, ii. 372.
Koropissus, ii. 369.
Kos, i. 2, 130; ii. 317, 370.
Kotiæium, ii. 362.
Kumane, ii. 245, 333, 358, 362.
Kurejat, ii. 303.
Kybistra, ii. 338.
Kynopolis (= Kunos), sup. et inf., ii. 317 f.
Kysis, ii. 314.

Lacedæmon, i. 2; ii. 246, 372, 374.
Lamasba, ii. 428.
Lambæsa, ii. 414 f., 424.
Lampe, ii. 362.
Lampsacus, ii. 41, 234, 368.
Lancia, ii. 436.
Langres, ii. 405.
Laodicea, ii. 96, 99, 243, 361.
Laodicea (Syr.), ii. 289.
Laranda, i. 453; ii. 358, 369.
Lares, ii. 428.
Larisa, ii. 288.
Larissa, ii. 246, 374.
Lasom, ii. 298.
Laureacum, *see* Lorsch.
Laurum, ii. 440.
Ledræ, ii. 292.
Legionum urbs, ii. 410.
Legisvolumen, ii. 432.
Lemnos, ii. 370.
Leon, ii. 436, 437 f.
Leontion, ii. 394.
Leontopolis, ii. 318.
Leptis magna, ii. 425, 428.
„ minus, ii. 428.
Letopolis, ii. 317.
Libya, ii. 85 f., 304 f., 323.
Liguria, ii. 396.
Lilybæum, ii. 394.
Limata, ii. 432.
Limenæ, ii. 363.
Limoges, ii. 403, 405.
Lincoln, ii. 411.
London, ii. 411.
Lorca, ii. 439 f.
Lorsch, ii. 378.
Lucar la Mayor, S., ii. 440.
Lucca, ii. 394.
Lugdunensis, ii. 404 f.
Lunda, ii. 362.
Luperciana, ii. 428.
Lusitania, ii. 437.
Lycaonia, ii. 356 f.
Lycia, i. 2; ii. 368 f.
Lycopolis, ii. 317, 319.
Lydda, ii. 259, 266.
Lydia, i. 4 f.; ii. 364 f.
Lyons, i. 4; ii. 74 f., 246, 399 f.
Lystra, ii. 243, 363.

Macedonia, i. 228; ii. 50, 51, 80 f., 460.
Macedonopolis, ii. 295.
Macomades, ii. 428.
Mactaris, ii. 428.
Madaba, ii. 303.
Madaura, ii. 246, 413 f., 424.
Madili, *see* Midila.
Magnesia, i. 237 f.; ii. 245.
Magydus, ii. 253, 369.
Mailand, ii. 397 f.
Mainz, ii. 246, 408 f.
Majuma, ii. 262.
Malaga, ii. 440.
Malta, ii. 243, 394.
Malus, ii. 103, 361.
Mamre, ii. 261.
Manganæa, *see* Batanea.
Marasch, *see* Germanicia.
Marazana, ii. 428.
Marcelliana, ii. 429.
Marcianopolis, ii. 376.
Mareotic district, ii. 313 f.
Margaritatum, ii. 288.
Marmarika, ii. 319.
Marseilles, ii. 399 f.
Martos, ii. 439.
Mascula, ii. 429.
Mauretania, i. 4; ii. 414 f., 419, 424 f., 432, 434, 438, 461.
Maximinianopolis (Egypt), ii. 317.
„ (Palest.), ii. 259.
„ (Pamph.), ii. 369.
Maxula, ii. 433.
Medicones, ii. 361.
Media, i. 2; ii. 296.
Medila, *see* Midila.
Megalopolis, ii. 372.
Megara, ii. 372.
Melitene, ii. 206 f., 213, 245, 289, 342 f.
Melos, ii. 370.
Membressa, ii. 425, 429.
Memphis, ii. 318 f.
Mende, ii. 405.
Mentesa, ii. 439.
Mercurialis pagus vet-

eranorum Medelitanorum, ii. 429.
Merida, ii. 436, 437 f.
Mesopotamia, i. 2; ii. 245, 295 f. 461.
Messina, ii. 394.
„ (Peloponn.), ii. 372.
Metelis, ii. 318.
Metropolis (Isaur.), ii. 369.
„ (Pisid.), ii. 363.
Metz, ii. 405.
Midila, ii. 429.
Miletus, ii. 243, 368.
Milev, ii. 429.
Misgirpa, ii. 429.
Mitylene, ii. 243.
Mlili, ii. 427.
Moabitis, ii. 252 f.
Mœsia, ii. 376 f., 448, 461.
Montemayor, ii. 440.
Montoro, ii. 440.
Mopsuestia, ii. 325.
Motella, ii. 362.
Moxiane, ii. 362.
Muguæ, ii. 429.
Municipium, ii. 440.
Murcia, ii. 436.
Mursa, ii. 377.
Muzula, ii. 429.
Myndas, i. 2.
Myra (Lyc.), ii. 246, 333, 368.
Myrsinë, ii. 319.
Mysia, ii. 364 f.

Nabatitis, ii. 254.
Nantes, ii. 405.
Naples, ii. 246, 391.
Narbonensis, ii. 82 f., 402 f.
Narbonne, ii. 403.
Naro, i. 4.
Naupactus, ii. 372.
Nazareth, ii. 253, 261.
Nazianzus, ii. 338.
Neapolis (Pisid.), ii. 363.
„ (Tripol.), ii. 425, 429.
„ (Zengit.), ii. 425 f.
Neapolis = Sichem, ii. 259.
Neocæsarea (Pont.), ii. 350 f.
„ (Syr.), ii. 288.
Neronias, ii. 325 f., 361.
Nicæa, ii. 355 f.
Nikiopolis, ii. 317.
Nikomedia, i. 463; ii. 203, 245, 332 f., 354 f., 465.
Nikopolis (Arm.), ii. 342.
„ (Epir.), ii. 243 f., 375.
„ (Palest.) *see* Emmaus.
Nilus (Nilopolis), ii. 313 f., 317.
Nisibis, ii. 295.
Nividunum, ii. 433.
Nizza, ii. 404.
Nocera, ii. 394.
Nola, ii. 394.
Noricum, ii. 376 f., 448.
Nova (Nova Petra), ii. 429.
Nova Sparsa, ii. 429.
Noviodunum, ii. 377, 433.
Noyon, ii. 405.
Numidia, i. 231 f.; ii. 414 f., 419 f., 460.

Oasis, small and great, ii. 317 f.
Obba, ii. 429.
Octavum, ii. 429.
Oea, i. 4; ii. 425, 429.
Olympus, ii. 368.
Opus, ii. 372.
Orange, ii. 404.
Oriolo, ii. 392.
Orleans, ii. 405.
Orléansville, ii. 434.
Orthesia, ii. 272.
Osroene, *see* Edessa.
Ossigi, ii. 448.
Ossonova, ii. 439.
Ossuna (Ursona), ii. 440.
Ostia, ii. 392.
Otrus, ii. 245, 333, 362.
Oxyrhynchus, ii. 313 f., 317.

Padua, ii. 397.
Pagæ, *see* Gagæ.
Palestine, i. 10 (Jews in), 229; ii. 247 f., 460 f.
Palmyra, ii. 276 f., 284, 300.
Paltus, ii. 272.
Pamphylia, i. 2; ii. 368 f.
Pandataria, ii. 244.
Paneas, i. 145; ii. 252 f., 276.
Panemon Teichos, ii. 369.
Panephysis, ii. 318.
Pannonia, ii. 80 f., 376 f., 461.
Panormus, ii. 394.
Paphlagonia, ii. 342 f., 348.
Paphos, ii. 243, 291 f.
Pappa, ii. 364.
Paratonium, ii. 319.
Parembole, ii. 318.
Parethia (?), ii. 355.
Paris, ii. 107, 403 f.
Parium, ii. 245, 332 f., 364.

Parnassus, ii. 338.
Parthia, i. 2 f.; ii. 177, 299.
Patara, ii. 368 f.
Patmos, ii. 370.
Patras, ii. 372.
Pavia, ii. 397.
Pele, ii. 375.
Pella, ii. 243, 248 f.
Peloponnesus, ii. 372 f.
Pelusium, ii. 318 f.
Pentapolis, *see* Cyrene.
Pepuza, ii. 245, 333, 362.
Peræa, ii. 254, 259.
Perdikia, ii. 369.
Pergamum, i. 2, 130; ii. 243, 366 f.
Pergê, ii. 243, 369.
Persa = Perra, ii. 295.
Persia, ii. 103, 295 f., 461.
Perugia, ii. 394.
Petra, ii. 303.
Pettau, ii. 377.
Phæno, i. 203; ii. 260, 268.
Phakusa, ii. 318.
Pharbætic district, ii. 318 f.
Phaselis, i. 2.
Phasko, ii. 319.
Philadelphia (Egypt), ii. 312 f.
„ (Arab.), ii. 303.
„ (Asian), i. 70, 238 f.; ii. 89 f., 243.
Philæ, ii. 322 f.
Philippi, i. 246 f.; ii. 195 f., 220 f., 226, 243, 372.
Philistia, ii. 461.
Philomelium, ii. 245, 322 f., 363.
Phœnicia, ii. 271 f., 461.
Phrebonitic district, ii. 307 ff.
Phrygia, i. 3 f. (Jews in), ii. 228 f., 245 f., 356 f., 457.
Phthenegys, ii. 318.
Phydela, ii. 343.
Picenum, ii. 392–393.
Piedmont, ii. 396, 461.
Pisa, ii. 392.
Pisidia, ii. 356 f.
Pityus, ii. 353.
Platæa, ii. 372.
Pocofeltæ, ii. 432.
Pompeii, ii. 391.
Pompeiopolis (Cilic.), ii. 325.
„ (Pont.), ii. 347.
Pontia, ii. 244.
Pontus, i. 224, 248; ii. 77 f., 244, 262, 347 f., 457.
Pontus Polemiacus, ii. 349 f., 357.
Porthmus, ii. 372.
Portus, ii. 392.
Præneste, ii. 392.
Proconsularis, *see* Africa.
Prosopitic district, ii. 307 f.
Prusa, ii. 355.
Prusa al., ii. 355.
Prymnessus, ii. 362.
Ptolemais (Cyren.), ii. 313 f.
„ (Phoenic.), ii. 243.
„ (Theb.), ii. 317 f.
Puteoli, ii. 243, 391.
Pydna, ii. 375.

Quintianum, ii. 392.
Quoturnicensis, ii. 430.

Rabba, ii. 303.
Raphaneæ, ii. 288.
Raphia, ii. 267.
Ravenna, ii. 396, 397.
Regensburg, ii. 409.
Resaina, ii. 295.
Rhætia, ii. 409 f., 448, 461.
Rheims, ii. 107, 405 f.
Rhodes, i. 2; ii. 370.
Rhossus, ii. 287, 290.
Rimini, ii. 392, 411.
Romagna, ii. 395 f.
Rome, i. 4 f. (Jews in), 20, 244 f., 448 (schools at), 463 f.; ii. 185 f., 192 f. (Jews in), 228 f., 243, 379 ff., 418 f., 439 (Mithraism), 458 f.
Rostoces, ii. 312.
Rotarium, ii. 432.
Rouen, ii. 404.
Rucuma, ii. 429.
Rusicade, ii, 429.

Sabaria, ii. 377.
Sabrata, ii. 430.
Sadagolthina, ii. 338.
Sagalbina, ii. 440.
Sais, ii. 307 f.
Salamis (Cyprus), ii. 243, 291.
Salavia, ii. 439.
Salerno, ii. 394.
Salona, ii. 378.
Salzburg, ii. 378.
Samaria (land and city), i. 58, ii. 249 f., 259, 266.
Samê (Cephallenia), ii. 246, 371.
Samos, i. 2.
Samosata, ii. 288.
Sampsame, ii. 2.
Sanaus, ii. 362.
Sansorus (?), ii. 355.

Saragossa, *see* Cæsaraugusta.
Sardica, ii. 376.
Sardinia, i. 5 f., 203; ii. 393.
Sardis, ii. 243, 366 f.
Sarin, ii. 343.
Sarmatia, ii. 157.
Saron, ii. 243.
Satafis, ii. 434.
Satala, ii. 344.
Scarabantia, ii. 377.
Scarphia, ii. 372.
Schedia, ii. 319.
Scili (Scilium), ii. 234, 246, 414 f. 424.
Scupi, ii. 375.
Scythia, ii. 81 f., 299, 379, 461.
Scythopolis, ii. 259, 263, 266, 270.
Sebaste (Armen.), ii. 342 f.
,, (Phryg.), ii. 358 f., 362.
,, *see* Samaria.
Sebennytus, ii. 318.
Sebulon, ii. 259.
Segermes, ii. 430.
Segni, ii. 392.
Selambina, ii. 440.
Seleucia (Isaur.), ii. 369.
,, (Pamphyl.), ii. 369.
,, (Pisid.), ii. 363.
,, (Syr.), ii. 245, 288.
,, Ctesiphon, ii. 297 f.
Senlis, ii. 405.
Sens, ii. 405.
Sepphoris, *see* Dioc. Palest.
Serae, ii. 160, 300.
Seville, ii. 438.
Shargerd, ii. 298.
Sibapolis, ii. 298.
Siblianoi, ii. 362.
Sicca, ii. 430.
Sichar, ii. 259, 268.
Sichem, ii. 266.
Sicilibba, ii. 430.
Sicily, ii. 392 f., 459.
Side, i. 2, ii. 369.
Sidon, ii. 243, 273.
Sigus, ii. 430.
Sikyon, i. 2.
Silandus, *see* Standus.
Simittu, i. 4.
Singidunum, ii. 377.
Singilia Barba, ii. 440.
Sinna, ii. 392.
Sinope, ii. 246, 332 f., 349.
Sipontum, ii. 394.
Sirmium, i. 492, ii. 377, 396.
Siscia, ii. 377.
Sitifis, i. 4; ii. 430, 433.
Smyrna, i. 3 f., 70, 238 f., 246 f., ii. 223 f., 243, 245, 366.
Sodom, ii. 303.
Soissons, ii. 405.
Solia, ii. 440.
Sousse, ii. 434.
Southern Italy, ii. 379 f., 458 f.
Spain, ii. 244, 319, 435 f., 460.
Spania (= Spalia), ii. 338.
Sparta, *see* Lacedæmon.
Spoleto, ii. 394.
Standus, ii. 366.
Stektorion, ii. 362.
Stobi, ii. 375.
Suburburensium gens, ii. 430.
Sufes, ii. 423, 430.
Sufetula, ii. 430.
Sutunurum, ii. 430.
Syarba, ii. 369.
Sydra, ii. 369.
Syene, ii. 314 f.
Synnada, i. 453; ii. 359, 362.
Syracuse, ii. 246, 392 f.
Syria, i. 2 f. (Jews in), ii. 376 f. (Christianity in), 458.
Syrtes, ii. 419.

Tabatha, ii. 267.
Tabennisi, ii. 216, 316.
Tanagra, ii. 372.
Tanis, ii. 318.
Taormina, ii. 394.
Taposiris, ii. 313, 319.
Tarraco, ii. 436.
Tarraconensis, ii. 437.
Tarragona, ii. 438 f.
Tarsus, ii. 80 f., 243, 324 f.
Tauche, ii. 319.
Tauric peninsula, ii. 379.
Tavium, ii. 361.
Teano, ii. 394.
Tegæa, ii. 372.
Tell el-Asch'ari, ii. 254.
Tentyræ, ii. 317.
Termissus, ii. 369.
Terni, ii. 394.
Terracina, ii. 392.
Teva, ii. 440.
Thabraca, ii. 430.
Thagara, ii. 433.
Thagastê, ii. 433.
Thagura, ii. 433.
Thambi, ii. 430.
Thamogade, ii. 422, 430.
Tharasa, ii. 430.
Thasarte (*see* following word).
Thasualthe, ii. 430.
Thautic district, ii. 319.

38731
Harnack, Adolf
Mission & expansion of Christianity
copyl
270.1Q
H229E
V.2
MAY 13
MAY 20 71
DEC 26 2001
270.1Q
H229E
V.2
C.1
38731